

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1856.

- ART. I.—1. *The Roman Empire of the West. Four Lectures delivered at the Philosophical Institution, Edinburgh, February, 1855.* By RICHARD CONGREVE, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College, Oxford. London: J. W. Parker & Son. 1855.
2. *Études sur l'Histoire du Gouvernement Représentatif en France, de 1789 à 1848.* Par LE COMTE LOUIS DE CARNÉ, ancien Député. Paris: Didier. 1855.
3. *De l'Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre.* Par M. LE COMTE DE MONTALEMBERT.

It is a blessed and consoling thought for all Christians, and one which they may well lay to heart amidst the social and political changes which are everywhere in progression round them, that there is no form of earthly government which can rob them, so but they be true to themselves, of their most precious heritage in this world—namely, the hope of salvation in the world to come. When men think upon the dead in Christ, it seldom occurs to them to pause, even for a moment, upon the thought of the temporal rule under which the friends, now in the world of spirits, lived and died; neither are such questions among those which have the most prominent place in the contemplation of our own eternal destiny. They must, when regarded from this point of view, occupy at best but a secondary rank; and over the portals through which we enter upon the study of earthly polity, there should ever be manifest to the mind's eye the solemn warning: '*Quærite ergo primum regnum Dei, et justitiam Ejus.*'

And as from the very highest place of survey political questions appear to lose much of the importance which many might feel inclined to assign to them, so too must it be confessed that from much humbler considerations that importance is again liable to diminution. We all remember how Goldsmith sings, in concluding his sketches of the various realms of Europe in

the 'Traveller' (though, by the way, Dr. Johnson is said to be partly responsible for the passage):—

'In every government, though terrors reign,
Though tyrant kings or tyrant laws restrain,
How small, of all that human hearts endure,
That part which laws or kings can cause or cure!'

Even Rogers, identified as he was with what is called the liberal school in politics, yet tells us, in a note to his 'Italy,' that 'to judge at once of a nation, we have only to throw our eyes 'on the markets and the fields. If the markets are well 'supplied, the fields well cultivated, *all is right*. If otherwise, 'we may say, and say truly, these people are barbarous or 'oppressed.' (A test this, we may observe in passing, which, while hopelessly condemnatory of the Turkish empire, would tend to justify the Austrian occupation of Lombardy.)

A friend of ours, who printed privately an interesting volume of travels, and has always been ardently attached to the free institutions of his own country, yet closed his book with the admission, that he had learned from travel 'that a fertile soil, a 'genial climate, and a bright sunshine, may produce much individual happiness even in those countries where trial by jury is 'unknown, and the writ of *Habeas Corpus* runneth not.' And a curious illustration of this truth is supplied, if we remember rightly, by the well-known American authoress, Mrs. Beecher Stowe, who, in her 'Sunny Memories,' mentions that she met with Prussians who had emigrated to America, and returned to their native land in despair of being happy on the other side of the Atlantic. The absence of amusements, the gravity, and the strain of constant work, had made life unendurable; they preferred the surveillance of Berlin police to the freedom of the United States. Cheap newspapers and universal suffrage had not proved to be the sole conditions of human happiness.

Shall we say, then, that political theories and questions concerning government are alike unworthy the attention of the religious thinker and of the philanthropist? Not so: we would only allot to them their due place, that so, within the limits thus affixed, they might be treated the more worthily. Although there may, and doubtless do, exist men for whom such problems have no charms, because their hearts are pre-occupied with higher, holier themes, yet in this, as in most things, there is room for much self-deceit. The lack of interest may arise from carelessness and indifference, quite as much as from high principle. If the time and thought devoted to these subjects might in some cases have been better spent, it is undeniable that in many instances they might and would have been spent in a far worse manner. If both the higher and the lower interests of the human race be frequently removed beyond the

sphere of political considerations, it nevertheless remains true, that both are also frequently intertwined with matters of state. The Book which contains the revelation of God's will assuredly does not ignore the possible existence of a science of temporal government. Therein we see portrayed, with great detail, the foreign and domestic policy of the chosen race, combined with partial but invaluable glimpses into the secrets of the great empires with which Israel came in contact; therein we find it prophesied that Christ's spiritual kingdom upon earth should have kings for nursing fathers, and queens for nursing mothers. The Head of our race, as man, not only condescends to be the Prophet of prophets, and the Priest of priests, but is likewise for all time the King of kings; nor does He disdain to recognise within their lawful sphere the prerogatives of Cæsar, while they trench not on those more sacred dues to the heavenly Father with whom He is One from all eternity. And the great Apostle of the Gentiles, while spending and being spent for the extension of his Master's name, is yet permitted to make full use of his privileges as a Roman citizen.

It must, therefore, be possible to consider the problems which temporal government suggests, not only in a philosophic, but likewise in a Christian, spirit. But the task is not an easy one. Not only are the landmarks of definite and universally acknowledged principles scanty and but faintly discernible, but they are also liable to that extensive, and often unconscious, modification which is caused by the circumstances under which each one has had his own lot cast. He who is sensible of many blessings vouchsafed to him through the agency of that government under whose shadow he has grown up—be its institutions imperial, democratic, or constitutionally regal—must be pardoned if he display some prejudice in favour of the system thus endeared to him. And not merely in different countries, but even within the same country, in how different an aspect will the same forms of government appear to men differently nurtured! How natural is it, for instance, that the mercantile class should imbibe a tone of mind unlike to that of the agriculturists! how often, too, are particular specimens of an order unfairly accepted as its true representatives! The student, brought up in the neighbourhood of some true-hearted squire or noble, accustomed to regard the great house as the focus of improvement and benevolence, will read history with a mind predisposed to recognise the merits of aristocracy. On the other hand, Wordsworth relates of himself, in the 'Prelude,' that—

'Born in a poor district, and which yet
Retaineth more of ancient homeliness
Than any other nook of English ground,
It was my fortune scarcely to have seen,

Through the whole tenor of my school-day time,
The face of one who, whether boy or man,
Was vested with attention or respect,
Through claims of wealth or blood.'

And this was a dispensation which, while it may have contributed largely to the late Laureate's fund of sympathy with the poor, and the human-heartedness of his poetry, yet likewise, we imagine, tended to make him in early life so warm a partisan of the first movers of the French Revolution. Bearing, therefore, in mind these differences,—remembering that it is impossible to write upon questions of policy in the style either of a treatise on pure science, such as mathematics, or of dogmatic expositions of religious doctrine—explanations of creed and catechisms, wherein one teaching is rightly proclaimed as a divine truth, and its opposite as deadly heresy,—remembering, we say, this great distinction, we submit to the charity and good temper of our readers the following pages upon the subject of Imperialism. If those who agree in the main with the principles advocated in this Review are unable to follow us in many of our arguments and assertions, let them understand, once for all, that we are discussing, for the most part, very open questions, and by no means consider our private sentiments concerning them to be binding upon the consciences of others.

By Imperialism we understand that form of government by which a country, sufficiently powerful to manage its internal affairs without the interference of neighbouring states, submits to the rule of one man, who executes its laws, controls its revenue, and commands its army, and thus becomes essentially responsible before God and man for the domestic and foreign policy of the realm beneath his sway. And not only is this the most ancient form of government, originally springing, as Aristotle admits,¹ from the patriarchal headship of families; but even to the present day it is more widely extended than any other. Whether we consider the amount of square miles, or the number of souls, the greater portion of the earth is at this moment under autocratic rule.

There are, indeed, very different species of autocracy; but they will be found, we believe, principally to fall under the four following heads:—

1. The Imperialism which, though not in strictness limited to Asia, may be roughly termed Oriental. Here the ruler is generally the head of the national religion, as well as of all temporalities. Sometimes he is actually a priest, as, in patriarchal times, Melchisedek. Such was the Virgilian idea of a sovereign

¹ πρῶτον ἐβασίλευοντο αἱ πόλεις, καὶ νῦν ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη ἐκ βασιλευμένων γὰρ συνήλθον. πᾶσα γὰρ οἰκία βασιλεύεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου. (Polit. i. 2.)

in heroic ages: 'Rex Anius, rex idem hominum, Phœbique sacerdos.' Such, too, the sentiment of the founders of the Athenian and Roman republics, when they retained those officers (the ἄρχων βασιλεὺς and *rex sacrificulus*) who performed the priestly functions of the abolished monarchy. In China, the emperor is the only priest: the earliest Mahometan caliphs were likewise high-priests; and even now, in Turkey, the chief mufti is but the sultan's representative. It is a peculiar feature in this type of Imperialism, that the land is frequently assumed to belong theoretically to the sovereign alone; that he is, as in China and Turkey, the sole fountain of rank and honour—which are only in rare cases hereditary; and that the law of succession does not recognise the right of the firstborn, but depends upon the will of the emperor. Thus, David of old appointed Solomon in preference to Adonijah; and, within the current century, the lord of the Celestial empire has been known to bequeath the sceptre to his seventeenth son. The Muscovite monarchy has only within the last two or three generations become hereditary; and, remembering the circumstances attending the inauguration of Nicholas' reign, it may scarcely be so considered at present. And, not to speak of Charlemagne's bequests to his different sons, we may remember that it was on the ground that Edward the Confessor had *willed* the kingdom to him, that the Duke of Normandy claimed the crown of England; whence lawyers have maintained that posterity has thwarted that monarch's desires by its obstinate refusal to translate *Gulielmus Conquestor* into anything but William the Conqueror. As, however, this system has died away in the West, we now venture to call it Oriental.

2. A second form of absolutism, and consequently of virtual Imperialism, is that attained to by the inheritors of limited monarchies, who have, either by individual strength, or by the progress of events, been enabled to break through the shackles which lessened their power. Thus, in ancient Greece, as Thucydides informs us in a well-known passage, despotism was established in the cities, in place of hereditary monarchies with defined privileges.¹

Thus Spain—which has been shown by Robertson, Hallam, and her own Balmes, to have been, at an early period in the history of modern Europe, one of the most strictly limited monarchies—had become, by the time of Philip II. a despotism. Thus France—the land of feudal barons, who had bearded their sovereign—was brought by Richelieu to that state of kingly absolutism, which culminated in Louis XIV. The same may be said of Hungary and Bohemia. Indeed, Blackstone asserts, 'that the limitation of the regal authority was a first and essen-

¹ ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς γέραςι πατρικαὶ βασιλείαι. I. 13.

'tial principle in all the Gothic systems of government established in Europe, though gradually driven out and overborne by violence and chicane, in most of the kingdoms on the Continent.'¹

And, perhaps, under this class of imperial rulers may be fitly included those conquerors who, though kings by birth, have infinitely extended their rule by force of arms, and thus brought their own people into a state of greater subjection. Such, for example, is Alexander, who begins his career as king of Macedonia; such Attila, originally monarch of the Huns alone; such, possibly, may be considered that hero of romance, as well as of history, the majestic Charlemagne.

3. A third form is that of the power conferred by several princes upon one of their own number. Such we may probably, with Arnold, imagine to have been the old chieftain-monarchs whom Homer paints. Poland long supplied a somewhat similar example. But the most dignified and famous was the Emperor of Germany; that emperor, whose coat of arms, when blazoned on the walls of English churches, took precedence of the bearings of England herself; who was raised to his proud pre-eminence by the vote of independent princes:—

'The Arch-Electoral Seven,
Like choral stars around the sun,
Gird him whose hand a world has won,
The anointed choice of Heaven.'

4. A fourth species of Imperialism remains. There have, in various ages of the world, been states of society, where either the old race of monarchs has been supplanted by a *novus homo*, who has contributed to their downfall; or where, amidst anarchy and sanguinary strife, some master-spirit has arisen, who has vaulted on the steed which was running wild and riderless, and bitted its mouth and brought it into sober paces; a deed of daring which, if tending to the aggrandizement of him who thus triumphs, is often not the less a blessing to the nation. In either case, the ruler who has thus arrived at supreme power, commonly holds it by uniting in his own person the functions of various offices, which had previously been a check upon each other. Among such men we think upon Dionysius I. and Agathocles in Sicily; upon the founders of Roman Imperialism, whose names are to this day given throughout Christendom to two of our summer months, July and August; we almost pause upon the name of Cromwell; and at length alight upon that of Napoleon Buonaparte, and of his nephew, the present Emperor of the French.

Such is a classification—a very rough one, and by no means unobnoxious to criticism, but sufficient for our purpose—of the

¹ Book I. chap. 7.

different species of Imperialism. We proceed to remark upon certain characteristics which are common to all the forms, and upon some of the attractions and the dangers, of such government.

And, firstly, let it be observed, that scarcely in any country, or at any period, has there existed such a thing as pure and unmitigated despotism. Some check is generally at hand, either in the customs of the people or a written code, in the influence exercised by soldiers, priests, or nobles, or again in the very dread of violence and assassination. Mahometan princes have been, of all rulers, perhaps the most absolute. But in their palmiest days of power, the Koran was always a real limitation; and now, as passing events may teach us, the endeavours of an amiable and personally excellent sultan may fail to command the conduct of subjects, who resent a *hatti-shereff*, as opposed to the first principles of their religion. Concerning other Asiatic despots, the reader may find, in M. Hue's 'Empire Chinois,' a just and amusing notice from the pen of one of the first of Oriental scholars, M. Abel Remusat. 'In India,' says M. Remusat, 'not all the adulation of language, which is lavished upon kings, can enable them to tax a Brahmin, or make a husbandman turn merchant. There is the code of Manu ever by his side,—a code considered to be revealed, and finally decisive, upon matters civil as well as religious. The *Son of Heaven*, as the Chinese emperor is termed, cannot choose the sub-prefect of a town out of any class of men, saving the list of candidates presented to him by the *literati*; nor could he omit to fast upon the day of an eclipse, without incurring the reprehension of a thousand pamphlets, which would immediately remind him of his duty.' Roman emperors, who had trampled on the Lamie and other noble houses, yet learnt (as the satirist reminds us) to fear the cobblers. Louis XIV., while designedly humbling his *noblesse*, did not lose all dread of the mob of the capital. The emperors of Germany had to struggle not only against the successful opposition of such pontiffs as Hildebrand and Innocent III., but likewise against the complexities of that intricate system of government, which at length broke down under the attacks of France, in the year 1806. It is impossible to read any history of the Germanic Empire without being struck at the amount of limitation imposed upon the will of its august sovereign; and the memory of its difficulties is preserved in one of those piquant fables of La Fontaine, which are often as just as they are witty. That lively writer makes an envoy of the sultan argue in favour of his master's powers as compared with those of the Teutonic Cæsar, by relating how he once found himself safe from the assaults of a hydra with an hundred heads, because these numerous heads prevented it from breaking through a hedge, but was thrown

into a state of well-founded alarm by the approach of another dragon with many tails, but only one head, which found no difficulty in making its way through all impediments. 'Je soutiens,' he adds—

' Je soutiens qu'il en est ainsi
De votre Empereur et du nôtre.'

Even Alexander was compelled, by the force of public opinion, to drop his scheme for obtaining divine honours from Greeks and Macedonians, as well as Persians. In many respects—as, for instance, his desire to create a number of *majorats*—was Napoleon I. obliged to wait for a day that never came; and the remark holds good with reference to the present ruler of the French. 'When told,' says a living politician, 'that the present emperor possesses absolute and irresponsible power, I answer by citing three things which he could not, if he would, accomplish; he could not endow with lands and tithes one religion as the exclusively paid religion of the State, although he selected for the privilege the Roman Catholic Church, which comprises more than nine-tenths of the French people; he could not create an hereditary peerage, with estates entailed by a law of primogeniture; and he could not impose a tax upon successions, which should apply to personal property only, and leave real estate free. Public opinion in France is an insuperable obstacle to any of these measures becoming law.' And as regards that threat of assassination which ought never to be named without execration by a Christian man, it must still be said that, criminal as it is, its presence to a real despot's thoughts may often be permitted to have a salutary effect. There is something startling in that page of Cicero's treatise 'De Officiis,' in which he specifies the deaths of Alexander of Pheræ, and of Phalaris, as instances of a general law—a law which had just been proclaimed anew by the slaughter of one far loftier, whom he does not openly name—the great Roman who fell by the hands of those to whom he had been a personal benefactor, on the ides of March, at the base of Pompey's statue. Bad as were they who conspired, it is not easy to read calmly the philosopher's comments upon the event. 'Reliquorum similes exitus tyrannorum; quorum haud ferè quisquam interitum talem effugit. . . . Quamvis enim demersæ sint leges alicujus opibus, quamvis timefacta libertas, emergunt tamen hæc aliquando aut judiciis tacitis, aut occultis de honore suffragiis. Acriores autem morsus sunt intermissæ libertatis, quam retentiæ.'¹ And from that scene our thoughts fly homeward to gaze upon that remarkable man, who was compelled to be content with the title of 'Lord Protector,' while sighing for the name as well as the authority of King, and hoping to be the founder of a new

¹ Lib. ii. cap. 7, § 24.

dynasty. We may see him with that powerful tract of 'Killing no Murder' in his hands, pondering its famous question,—Whether those who had struck down the lion should pay homage to the wolf—with armour beneath his dress and pistols concealed upon his person; his routes continually and suddenly changed; his chamber seldom the same; until the spirit that had never quailed in the open field of battle, is broken down and crushed by this constant dread of assassination. That dread, however, is not entirely limited to those who have carved their own way to supreme power. Oriental monarchies have been defined as 'despotism tempered by assassination:' and it was within the present century that a czar was described as having been seen preceded by the murderers of his grandfather, surrounded by those of his father, and followed by those who would probably become his own.

If the fear of such a fate has at times inspired cruelty, it has also, probably, in other cases, whispered counsels of moderation, and thus become a check upon the excesses of despotism.

It must not, however, thence be argued that there is, after all, but little difference between an autocrat and a constitutional king. Not only is the range within which the autocrat can act freely, and of his own will, far greater; but he is likewise able to *initiate*, and thus become (as has been intimated) responsible to a far greater degree than is possible for the bearer of a limited regality. It may illustrate our meaning, if we remind the reader that hundreds, if asked what one person was, in their opinion, most responsible for the last great European war, would at once name the late Emperor Nicholas; that as many, if called upon to select the chief author of the peace, would choose the Emperor Napoleon III.; but that it would be hard to find a single person who attributed either the war or the peace to the individual authority or influence of Queen Victoria.

We have said that absolutism is, of all forms of government, the most widely extended. Must it not in fairness be added, that it possesses a wonderful fascination for the human heart,—that it has rallied around itself, in many an age and many a clime, some of the noblest and most generous sentiments of which man's nature is capable,—that it has wrought great benefits for mankind, which could scarcely have been effected by any other kind of rule;—and that, even when abused, it has often proved a wonderful instrument in the hands of Providence for the accomplishment of great designs? Of the four great empires of antiquity, three were ruled by autocrats throughout, and the fourth at length adopted the same regimen. And among the possessors of such formidable power, how many have there been whose very names it is impossible to recal without that conscious thrill of emotion which the contemplation of departed

greatness can hardly fail to evoke! Cyrus, Nerva, the Antonines, Charlemagne, Rodolph of Hapsburg, Akbar, and many more, *must* be ranked among the benefactors of their race. Even the most ardent republican, who looks upon the days which needed such governance as past, might willingly admit thus much. Writers of another school have maintained that such monarchy alone is really government; that it alone reproduces upon earth an image of the Divine Sovereignty, and thus becomes an antidote to our individual self-will, and a school of training for the courts of heaven. For ourselves, without adopting to the full so extreme a doctrine, we do not doubt but that millions of souls have lived in peace, and have attended to their domestic and religious duties with greater steadiness and zeal, from the consciousness that their lives reposed under the safety-giving shadow of Imperialism.

And if the rule of one man has been endeared to many nations by the prestige of custom, and the attachment felt to ancient families,—so, too, has the order produced by such sway been welcomed as an improvement upon the lawlessness of feudal barons, or as a source of peace and rest after the strife of factions. When we read of the obstacles to commerce, such as the blocking-up of rivers, and the fees and annoyances upon the roads in France (where an overturned vehicle could not be righted without the leave of the seigneur)—of the difficulties in the way of navigation and of agriculture, which feudality caused, and which the vigorous hand of an unchecked royalty removed—we recognise one of the many benefits to be derived from the voice of a master.¹ Nor need we pause again to do more than allude to the sense of weariness which, after the experience of the bloody alternations of a Sylla, a Marius, and the Triumvirs, at Rome—the ravages of civil war—and the oppression of the military in England, and the Reign of Terror in France—caused numbers who had little affection for the new chieftain, to acquiesce respectively in the rule of an Augustus, a Cromwell, a Napoleon.

Another claim advanced by the admirers of Imperialism is, its patronage of every kind of talent, more especially in the fields of literature and art. They remind us that letters began to flourish at Athens under the sway of the Peisistratidæ; and that the most splendid ornamentation of that city went hand in hand with one of the most wondrous outbursts of genius which the world has seen under the rule of Pericles, when (as the great historian remarks) the Government, though in name a democracy, was, in reality, under the guidance of its greatest man.² They

¹ See article *Roi* in M. Cheruel's excellent *Dictionnaire Historique* (Paris, Hachette, 1855). For our acquaintance with this work we must thank our able contemporary, the *Saturday Review*.

² Thucyd. ii. 65.

point to Hiero, at Syracuse, with Æschylus and Pindar for his guests—Epicharmus and Simonides, his correspondents: to Alexander, with Aristotle for his tutor—Apelles, his chief artist: to Augustus, irradiated by Virgil, Horace, Livy, and some lesser stars of the literary firmament: to Lorenzo de Medici, with Ficino, Landino, and Politian, by his side: to Philip IV. of Spain, the patron of Calderon's pen, and of the pencil of Murillo and Velasquez. They bid us observe that the Elizabethan constellation of Sidney, Raleigh, Spenser, Shakspeare, shone forth around the throne of a Tudor princess, than whom few in England have been more absolute. And, while they claim for the first Napoleon and his nephew the merit of having rendered Paris so striking a capital, they look backward to the reign of *Le Grande Monarque* for a more varied display of genius round an autocratic sceptre. In the well-known words of a panegyrist of Louis XIV. (and *this* eulogy, at least, is simple fact), 'Turenne, Condé, Luxembourg, were his generals; Colbert, Louvois, Torcy, were his statesmen; Vauban, his engineer; Perrault constructed his palaces, and they were adorned by Le Poussin, and Le Brun; Le Nôtre laid out his gardens; Corneille and Racine wrote his tragedies, Molière his comedies; Boileau was his poet; Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, were his preachers.'

Another advantage, almost too obvious to need mention, is the rapidity, secrecy, and freedom, of movements in war, and in all the procedures of diplomacy, attained by Imperialism. Examples of superiority thus won may be found *passim* in the pages of history.

We may add, too, a point upon which Republicanism claims a kind of sympathy with Autocracy (it is not the only political illustration of the proverb that *extremes meet*); we refer to what may be termed the openness and directness of the rule. In a limited Government, as that of a Constitutional Monarchy, there exists a real and practical danger of the system pretending to be one thing, while it is, in fact, another. It calls itself *μοναρχία*—the rule of one; it is constantly found to prove the rule of an oligarchy, or of the populace. But democracy proclaims the governance of the people by itself, and carries out its theory into practice. Imperialism, in like manner, professes to be the sway of an individual mind, and acts accordingly; perhaps even more purely and consistently than democracy itself. For democracy may be often leavened by the influence of the old families in a State, and thus imbibe a tinge of the oligarchical spirit. Such was often the case with the Italian Republics; such appears to be the idea of that somewhat inconsistently aristocratic republican, Sismondi; such was the political condition, until a very recent period, of Geneva; such is

even now, if we mistake not, that of Berne. Still there remains in this feature of directness, enough that is common to autocratic and to democratic rule to create a certain occasional sympathy between the partisans of either regimen. Thus we see individuals, and entire nations, rush from one to the other of these poles of the political globe. Thus Louis Napoleon, in those 'Idées Napoléoniennes' which he published while yet uncalled to power, declared that, in *his* estimation, the Governments of Russia and of the United States were the only two that were really fulfilling their functions: and these two great nations, apparently so estranged from each other's modes of thought, have hitherto preserved an unbroken, nay, even a cordial amity, throughout the whole of their diplomatic intercourse.

But that which indeed distinguishes Imperialism from every other kind of rule, and which constitutes at once its peculiar force and charm, is its attribute of *Personality*. Abstract principles, codes of law, a national cause—all these are great things in their way; but they do not satisfy the heart's instincts. Man loves to look up to the spirit of his brother-man; while time lasts, he must be a hero-worshipper. Even in the region of science, does not the young aspirant after fresh discoveries turn fondly to the great names—perhaps to *some one* favourite name—in the records of the past? Archimedes and Galileo, Kepler and Newton—are they not as kings of his spirit, embodiments of all that he is striving for? The rising orator may study the technicalities of his art, but his great teacher is the actual speech once uttered by a Chatham, or a Demosthenes. The poet reads pages of criticism; but his model is drawn less from the precepts of Aristotle, or Boileau, than from the ever-living impress of a Homer, a Dante, and a Shakspeare. What 'Epitome Rei Militaris' by a Vegetius, or others, can avail to the young soldier, in place of the vivid narrative of the campaigns of a Hannibal, a Cæsar, a Napoleon? Not all the attractions arising out of the Great Exhibition in Hyde Park, of 1851, could suffice to win for the 'Illustrated London News' so large a circulation, as the single event of the Duke of Wellington's funeral in the year following. Even republics look back—now in the dim twilight of legend, now in the clear page of history—to a single name as for ever entwined with their origin—a Brutus or a Tell, a Washington or a Bolivar. And if for a moment we turn from things of earth to those of heaven, how deeply do we find all true religion to be imbued with the doctrine of *Personality*! In this respect, Christianity stands pre-eminent, as over all the false religions of the universe, so, likewise, over the less perfect revelations accorded to the patriarchs and to Moses. The Christian is not called simply to obey a law, nor to reverence an abstract, impersonal *anima mundi*. But he has

learnt to look upward to a living Jehovah, who has revealed Himself as possessing, in the unity of the Divine Essence, a threefold Personality. A personal Creator and Father; a personal Redeemer, the Eternal Son; a personal Sanctifier, the Holy Spirit; a personal Arch-enemy, the apostate Angel with his followers; a personal leader, S. Michael, of those obedient spirits who wage war against the dragon and his angels; a personal Head of the human race, as truly our Elder Brother in his manhood, as our Saviour, by the might of His Godhead;—these are the teachings of the Church. Respect, therefore, admiration, reverence for some even of our fellow-mortals, arise naturally out of men's mental constitution; an enthusiasm most miserable and pernicious, if it merely rest on man—if it be perverted from its true direction, to a weak idolatry of power, genius, beauty, apart from true wisdom and benevolence; but excellent, if it leads men onwards from all these glorious gifts to their One Giver; if it come to see in the leaders of our common humanity—heroes, chieftains, poets, inventors, saints—a broken and partial reflex of the Light that never pales; a ray to direct our gaze to Him, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords.

It is, we repeat, this notable characteristic which lends to Imperialism its attraction, and confers upon it its potent influence for evil or for good, in a manner which no other form of Government can possibly attain to. Patriotism may exist in equal strength under democracy, autocracy, or constitutionalism. Witness the constant glorification of America by our republican cousins;¹ the intense affection of the Russians for their native land; the love of Englishmen (sometimes, perhaps, narrow and insular, but not the less sincere and hearty) for their sea-girt home. But neither democracy nor constitutional monarchy can, of themselves, gratify that yearning which, at times, is felt in all communities for the strong hand and concentrated will of an individual mind. We say *of themselves*, because it is perfectly possible that a Camillus or a Chatham may, for a season, become the virtual ruler of such states. But it is individuality, and that alone, which summons other spirits around itself, and awakes their burning hatred or undying love.

Segno d'immensa invidia,
E di pietà profonda,
D'instinguibil odio,
E d'indomato amor.

¹ 'Le premier trait de caractère que je remarque . . . c'est l'occupation constante et la glorification perpétuelle de la patrie. L'Amérique est l'idée fixe des Américains: la conviction de la supériorité de leur pays est au fond de tout ce qu'ils disent: on la retrouve même dans l'aveu de ce qui leur manque.' (M. Ampère: Promenade en Amérique, p. 3.) Compare, with respect to Russia, Mr. Cobden's pamphlet, *What Next? and Next?* And on the general question of *personal* arbiters of the world's destinies, see a passage of much force and beauty in one of Trench's *Hulscan Lectures*, headed *The Vanquisher of Hades*.

What code or principle has ever made men fight so ardently as the Tenth Legion did for Cæsar, or the Old Guard for Napoleon? It is upon Achilles, not upon the cause at stake between Greece and Troy, that our interest is centered in the Iliad. The Jacobites of the Scottish Highlands, the Legitimists of La Vendée, strove and suffered for *persons*, although (as in many other cases) an idea was entwined with the career of these persons. It is in no spirit of disloyalty that we avow our conviction, that it is simply impossible to bear precisely the same feeling towards the holder of a limited monarchy, because we do not receive from such a personage, however august, the same kind of influence upon the career of ourselves and those around us.

If further illustration of this point be needed, it is not far to seek. There is one of the dependencies of Great Britain, which, though governed like the rest by a subject, yet remains peculiarly free from the machinery of our home administration. We allude to Hindostan. Now, not to speak of the strong impression for good or evil, of terror or of justice, of magnificence in either case, made upon the population (whether native or British) of India, by Clive, Warren Hastings, Wellesley, and others, let us glance for a moment at the rule of its latest Governor-General. Other Colonial Governors may have rivalled the Marquis of Dalhousie in antiquity of lineage—perhaps even in ability; many have surpassed him in the influence conferred by wealth; several, perhaps, also, in popularity of manners. But he has had a position where a man, endowed with the requisite courage and talent, may still govern monarchically; and, as our French neighbours would express it, he has proved equal to his destiny. ‘He has governed us,’ say the Anglo-Indians, ‘like a king of the olden time. When danger or disturbance lowered, the question was—not what will the Government do, but—what will Lord Dalhousie do?’ And mark the termination of this noble man’s tenure of power. When, prematurely worn out by the cares of state and effects of climate, this Governor takes his departure from the country he has administered so grandly, men’s hearts prove too full for utterance; they feel that a presence, which had been a pledge of safety, of stability, and progress, is being withdrawn, and the broken cheer dies away in sobs of lamentation. Strange power of a kingly and commanding spirit; causing others to lean upon it, as by native right, and without involving, on the part of the homage-givers, the slightest shade of meanness or servility!

‘A despot thou, and yet thy people free,
And by the heart, not hand, enslaving us.’

It is high time, however, to mention some other drawbacks besides those incidentally alluded to, to which this form of

government is liable. But it may be well, before proceeding to these, to speak briefly upon the much-vexed question of the origin of executive, and more especially imperial, power in the State.

Waiving upon the one hand the extravagant theories of Rousseau's '*Contrat Social*,' and on the other the teaching of those who would represent monarchy as the only form of government which can claim Divine sanction, there remain two leading theories concerning the rights of sovereignty, both of which have found supporters among reasonable and religious men. These opposite schools agree in allowing that all temporal power is derived from God; but they are at issue upon the question whether, in the case of monarchy, the original tenure is mediate or immediate. On the side of its being immediate, we see quoted the expressions of Homer and Hesiod, the canonists and doctors of their day; the language of the upholders of the patriarchal theory, from S. Chrysostom to the Caroline divines in England, and Fleury, Bossuet, and their followers, in France; to whom, possibly, we may add Count Joseph de Maistre. Perhaps, too, appeal might be made to the expression *vicarius Dei*, so often applied to kings by bishops in ancient times, and by legal writers of the middle ages. Further, an example of a royalty thus emanating directly from on high is seen in the line of David, established on the throne of Judah (for it is idle, as some writers seem inclined, to restrict the *jus Dicum* in this case to Saul, David, and Solomon, against the direct teaching of Scripture¹); and the claim to a resemblance of this right is expressed or implied in the language of Oriental monarchs, and of many princes of the Stuarts and of the house of Bourbon. But the contrary doctrine—that royal authority, though permitted of God and surrounded by Him with sanctions peculiarly august and solemn, yet comes *mediately* through the people—is likewise supported by great names. It has been disgraced, it is true, by such advocates of the wicked theory of tyrannicide as the Presbyterian Buchanan and the Spanish Jesuit Mariana; but it is a mistake to imagine that it does not number more sober and trustworthy thinkers among its advocates. It is, beyond question, the doctrine of Hooker; it is taught, too, by Aquinas; by Suarez (whose words are quoted with delight by Hallam, in his '*Literature of Europe*') probably by Fenelon and a large party of the Gallican divines; by the later Spaniards, as recently by Balmes, with much fulness of detail in his chief work, that upon comparative civilisation; by M. de Carné, in the book named at the head of this article; and finally, with great

¹ Consider, e. g., 2 Samuel vii. 12—16; Lamentations iv. 20.

dignity, and in a very religious spirit, by Sir Francis Palgrave, in his 'Normandy and England.'

Where doctors disagree, it becomes us to speak modestly. We are far from thinking that the direct or patriarchal theory is so devoid of reason as many would represent it to be. It has a *quasi* sanction from Aristotle, and its principles could hardly, perhaps, have won so much affection and support in the day of its distress, had they been wholly devoid of truth. Balmes, who is one of its most recent antagonists, must be read with caution; although too upright for intentional dishonesty, he catches so readily at everything that makes for his case, as to quote one page from an author without observing the modifications introduced into the next. If, as none can doubt, the royalty of Judah was a channel of blessing to God's ancient people no less than its priesthood; if, with Hengstenberg, we may recognise a type of the twofold rule in Zechariah's vision of the two golden pipes conveying the golden oil; then, assuredly, any reproduction of such a rule, even if faintly imaged, must be a blessing still, and that people has preserved no light treasure which can point to a royal sceptre descending down a long line, and wedded, as in Jerusalem of old, to the concomitant authority of God's Church.

But still it must be remembered that the same voice which founded the throne of Judah, did likewise permit, and even in some sense sanction, the rebellions and treacheries connected with the foundation and continuance of the kingdom of Israel. Not, of course, in such wise as that sin could become right; but with a kind of recognition, if one may so speak reverently, of the principle *fieri non debuit, factum valet*. Jeroboam, having received a promise of the ten tribes, ought to have waited in faith until God should put them under him in His own good time. But his restless ambition, as well as the folly of Rehoboam, was overruled to the fulfilment of the Divine purpose. So strongly, indeed, does S. Augustine appear to have been struck by the sanction thus afforded to the new kingdom, that he considers it (though this is probably an over-lenient judgment) to excuse both prince and people.¹ But whatever be the theoretical claims of patriarchism, there is probably no temporal government now extant upon earth which could take its stand upon those claims. One power indeed there is which holds directly of the Almighty, in the unbroken series mounting up to the day of the resurrection of its first Giver, to last until the resurrection of all mankind;

¹ 'Prohibitum est populus pugnare cum fratribus suis, dicente Deo per prophetam, se hoc fecisse. Unde apparuit nullum in eâ re, vel regis Israël, vel populi fuisse peccatum, sed voluntatem Dei vindicantis impletam.'—De Civ. Dei, lib. xvii. cap. 21.

we mean, of course, the power of the priesthood—‘that golden chain which is bound unto the Apostle’s bench.’¹ But where, in casting our eyes over the list of earthly potentates, can we find a similar spectacle? The Chinese monarchy is, no doubt, of immense antiquity; but the present dynasty of Mantchou Tartars has only reigned for 200 years, and it gained its seat by force of arms. The native princes of Hindostan are, for the most part, of comparatively recent origin. The family of Romanoff, in Russia, may have been religiously chosen; but still it *was* chosen by subjects, and that not 260 years since. Rodolph of Hapsburg was also an *elected* emperor. The house of Bourbon is probably the oldest line in Europe. Charles X. could trace in a direct line for a period little short of 900 years; but his claim rested at length upon Hugh Capet, and Hugh Capet won his own way to a throne which he did not inherit. What does the very title given in Germany betoken? *Der Kaiser* assumes a succession to the office and dignity of the Roman emperor, and thus recalls our minds, if we suffer them to dwell upon it, to the career of a soldier of fortune. One can hardly wonder at the words which Walter Scott places in the mouth of Cromwell:—‘What can they see ‘in the longest kingly line in Europe, save that it runs back ‘to a successful soldier? I grudge that one man should be ‘honoured and followed because he is the descendant of a ‘victorious commander, while less honour and allegiance are ‘paid to another, who, in personal qualities and in success, ‘might emulate the founder of his rival’s dynasty.’ We do not mean that the sentiment admits of *no* reply; but it is natural, and not without foundation.

We are not, of course, denying the submission due to dynasties in actual possession, though their career may have thus commenced. It was through obedience to the decree of a sovereign *de facto* only that the Holy Nativity took place, as had been foretold, at Bethlehem. It is of such rulers that the Apostle speaks, in the famous chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; and likewise his fellow Apostle, in a passage which certainly seems to make for the theory of Hooker and Suarez.² And it has been ingeniously and not irrationally suggested, that our Divine Master’s sanction of the payment of tribute-money to Cæsar may afford a hint to Christians of the point at which *they* may conscientiously yield obedience to a fresh civil authority. If that authority is so recognised that its coin is admitted as the medium of exchange, its tenure may be fairly considered as a *fait accompli*. Questions of casuistry may no doubt arise concerning fair occasions of recalling the

¹ Le Baa.² 1 S. Peter ii. 13, 14.

deposed family; but if, when a throne is vacant, there be elected to the vacancy one who had no concern in disinheriting his predecessor, and had not taken oaths of allegiance to him, we see not how it is possible to deny to such a monarch a certain sort of right divine, nor why there need be a necessary inconsistency in a legend which admits the *voluntas populi* as a condition or a medium of the *gratia Dei*.

Apologising for this meagre treatment of questions, which would demand a separate essay to sift them thoroughly, we turn to the consideration of some of the drawbacks and evils but too frequently attendant upon Imperialism.

The patriarchal rights of the firstborn were the throne, the priesthood, and a double portion. But, as if to show the danger of too great a concentration of power in a simple person, it was ruled that in the chosen race the royalty should go to Judah, the priesthood to Levi, and the double portion to the sons of Joseph. And when we reflect upon the degree of influence exercised in Israel by prophets, in Judah by both priests and prophets, we may gather some idea of the importance of a check upon the sway of absolute monarchy. *Some* check, as we have said, does generally exist; but it may become infinitesimally small. And so unfitted is human nature, under these circumstances, for the immense power devolving upon it—so utterly does it tend to blind the mind's eye and indurate the fibres of the heart—as to render but too intelligible the assertion of Plato, that he of all men would be most miserable who, desiring to become a tyrant, should have his wishes gratified. Hippias, Dionysius, Julius Cæsar, Bajazet, Timour, and a long list of despotic rulers besides, may have been great men, but can hardly be accounted good or happy ones. True that such have been instruments of good, but too often only in that way in which the Almighty brings good out of evil. We must not allow ourselves so to be dazzled by the lustre of great exploits, as to forget the amount of misery inflicted upon thousands of the poor and humble (nor those alone) by mighty conquerors. It is no retraction of what has here been said upon *personality* to remember that the meadow of Runnymede, and the battle-fields of Marathon and Morgarten, have likewise associations for which we must be deeply grateful, and a magic and a poetry of their own.

'Two voices are there; one is of the sea,
One of the mountains—each a mighty voice:
In both from age to age thou didst rejoice;
They were thy chosen music, Liberty!'

It is, perhaps, the simplicity of each extreme, democracy and imperialism, that wins the suffrages of those who are fond of

bold and vigorous outlines in their creed. Thus poets often, like Shakspeare, or the Jacobite minstrels of Scotland, breathe contempt for the multitude, and deep loyalty to persons; or else, with Milton, are democrats even to the point of being regicides at heart. Thus music unlocks her treasures for Haydn's 'God save the Emperor,' and the wild wails of highland minstrels lamenting for Prince Charlie; or bursts forth into the terrible but grand and triumphant strain of the 'Marseillaise.' But those who are not advocates for either of these extreme forms of government, will naturally call to mind that it is not only in their attractive features that they have points in common. They will remember the famous *dictum* of the Stagyrite (to which Burke so naturally appealed in reference to the French revolutionists), that there is a kind of democracy analogous to a regal tyranny, the temper of each being identical; the popular decrees in one case corresponding to the royal injunctions in the other, and the demagogue in the republic playing the part of the flatterer in the court.¹

In Asia, no other rule than that of an individual autocrat appears even conceivable. The native Hindoos, as is well known, imagine the East India Company to be an old gentleman, or a princess. But if this be an argument in favour of Imperialism in Oriental climes, and perhaps in Africa, it must not be forgotten that Thucydides and Aristotle both pronounce limited monarchy to be more ancient than despotism in Europe. Blackstone and others, as we have observed, say the same of the Gothic monarchies of Christendom. It may likewise be argued that some of the benefits attributed to imperial regimen are equally attainable under any government containing a reasonable degree of centralization; while the honours of others must be shared with diverse, and frequently antagonistic, elements of social existence. If, for example, one emperor created the route of the Simplon, and another that of the Stelvio, yet the Swiss cantons of Uri and Ticino emulated these achievements by the formation of the road over the S. Gothard. If Julius Cæsar projected, and Justinian magnificently carried out, the codification of the Roman laws, that work was nevertheless, in Gibbon's phrase, 'a tessellated pavement of antique and costly, but too often of incoherent, fragments;' those fragments being derived from the decrees of the Senate, the writings of the Stoic philosophers, and the labours of great lawyers, not merely of the empire, but of the republic—as Ælius Pætus, the Catos, Mucius Sævola, and Servius Sulpitius. If, as Napoleon himself prophesied, and as great English lawyers maintain, the Code Napoleon will outlast the

¹ Aristot. Polit. Lib. iv. cap. 4th (ed. Bekker).

fame of all its author's victories, yet a great portion of that widely-extended code was a mere transcript of the decisions of the French parliaments.

Still greater must be the deductions from the praise which is given to absolutism for its patronage of literature and art. In at least three remarkable instances of literary effulgence under individual rulers, the *literati* who were indebted to the peace enjoyed under the sway of a dictatorial authority, were no less indebted to the free air which they had inhaled in earlier days. The great writers who surrounded Pericles, Augustus, and Lorenzo de' Medici, were not the children of an age inured to settled despotism. The era of Pericles was succeeded by one of still greater liberty, and Athenian letters continued to flourish. The age of Augustus was followed by a period of iron despotism, and the human mind seemed to be dwarfed—to lose all original and creative force. Even in *his* day, while we think upon the liberal patronage extended to the author of the *Æneid*, and his friend the lyricist and satirist, we must not forget that other bard, who, no less favoured than these until his fiftieth year, was suddenly banished for life to the wild and barbarous shores of the Euxine. Still less must we pass over that reign of Domitian, when imperial wrath raged not only against authors, but against their works; and officers were deputed to burn in public the writings of the brightest geniuses of the day; when philosophers were expelled from Rome, and memory herself (to adopt the vivid imagery of the biographer of Agricola) might have perished, if oblivion had been as possible as silence. The low standard of literary excellence produced under the imperial *régime* of Rome is certainly most remarkable. Yet a parallel upon a smaller scale is afforded by the first French empire, when, as a contemporary reminds us, Fontanes was considered a great orator, and Lebrun a master of fiction. Nor have autocratic patrons of literature always proved felicitous in their choice of objects, if we look to the tone, rather than the ability, of the patronised. The school of thinkers and of artists encouraged by the Medici was, after all, a sadly heathenised school. And if we recal the name of the one writer of the last century who, above all others, has poisoned the mind of Europe, and injured the largest number of souls, it can hardly be overlooked that no light part of the dire influence of Voltaire arose out of the countenance which he received from two despotic sovereigns—Frederic of Prussia, and the Czarina Catherine.

It may well be doubted whether religion has, upon the whole, gained by the existence of despotism. We do not indeed dispute that the work of Constantine, and again that of Charlemagne,

were highly beneficial to Christendom, despite the lines of Dante on the imaginary *ricca dote*, and the too great tendency to interference in affairs of the Church which Palgrave attributes to Charlemagne. But, independently of the temptation to individual baseness and hypocrisy, there are two ways in which absolutism has proved injurious to religion. In the first place, as extreme begets extreme, and violence violence, political despotism has given birth to spiritual despotism. The lawlessness of German emperors led to the unfounded and extravagant claims of the Papacy. Instead of each being a check upon the other, each sought to usurp the other's place. It was well that Solomon should fulfil prophecy, and depose the priest Abiathar for rebellion. It was well that the priesthood should withstand Uzziah, when he presumed to usurp Aaronic functions. But it is a very different case, when either bishop or emperor attempts to unite in himself the twofold power. For a comment on such attempts, with reference to the Papacy, we may refer to the famous lines of one who, though an ardent Ghibelline, was certainly no Protestant.

' Soleva Roma, che 'l mondo buon feo,
 Due Soli aver, che l'una e l'altra strada
 Facean vedere, e del mondo, e di Deo.
 L'un l'altro ha spento, ed è giunta la spada
 Col pastorale, e l'un coll' altro insieme
 Per viva forza mal convien che vada;
 Perochè giunti, l' un l' altro non teme.
 * * * * *
 Di oggimai, che la Chiesa di Roma,
Per confondere in sè duo reggimenti,
 Cade nel fango, e sè brutta e la soma.' ¹

Palliation for this conduct, and for the claim of the deposing power on the part of the Papacy, has been made on the avowed ground of the brutality, and the disregard of all mercy and justice, displayed by the mediæval monarchs. Such is the line taken by latitudinarian or unbelieving writers in France, as

¹ Dante, *Purgatorio*, Cant. XVI.—

' Rome that turn'd [the world] to good
 Was wont to boast two suns, whose several beams
 Cast light on either way—the world's and God's.
 One since hath quenched the other; and the sword
 Is grafted on the crook; and, so conjoin'd,
 Each must perforce decline to worse unaw'd
 By fear of other.

The Church of Rome,
 Mixing two governments that ill assort,
 Hath miss'd her footing, fallen into the mire,
 And there herself and burden much defiled.'

Cary.

MM. Comte and Michelet; and, in some degree, by more religious thinkers in our own country, as Sir J. Stephen, and (for the early period of the struggle) Dr. Arnold. M. Guizot and Dean Milman, likewise, exhibit much candour and forbearance upon the subject. Nevertheless, however true it may be that (as Mr. Chenevix Trench remarks) 'Papal Rome of the middle ages had a work of God to accomplish for the taming of a violent and brutal world, in the midst of which she often lifted up the only voice which was anywhere heard in behalf of righteousness and truth;' it does not, of course, follow that a false claim could be other than false, nor in the long run fail to prove a seed of evil. By thus urging pretensions which they and their adherents have long since virtually resigned, the popes of Rome have for all time supplied an argument for Erastian statesmen, and weakened the cause of all true spiritual freedom. Churchmen can no longer maintain that the Pontificate can be safely entrusted with power, and is innocent of all designs against the authority of the *Regale*—for politicians are always able to make a short reply, by the mere pronouncement of the name of *Hildebrand*.

But far more widely extended—far more consonant to the tone of the nineteenth century—is the opposite danger which religion incurs at the hands of despotism. There have been historians and political philosophers, who have expressed a lively admiration of imperial governance, because they hoped, through its instrumentality, to extinguish every spark of religious freedom. The disciples of these teachers are at present very numerous. Such, we fear, was one main ground of David Hume's preference for monarchical rule: such is the kind of attachment to individual sovereignty taught by Hobbes in the 'Leviathan:' such the homage paid to crowned heads by Diderot and Voltaire. But while true loyalty is a noble and ennobling sentiment, it is by religious principle alone that it can be leavened with that combination of humility with self-respect, which preserves it from degenerating into baseness and servility. There is no true dutifulness in blind submission to unhallowed commands.

'Daniel nobly disobeyed, but not from a spirit of sedition;
And Azarias shouted from the furnace, I will not bow down, O King.'

When Hobbes lays down that the sovereign is necessarily judge of doctrines; that the pretensions of citizens to judge for themselves and determine upon public religion are dangerous to the state,—this may be a recommendation in some sense of authority, but it in nowise breathes the spirit of Christian loyalty. Justly does Hallam assert that it sears the heart,

destroys the sense of wrong that has consoled the wise and good in their dangers, and confounds the principles of moral approbation—the notions of good and ill desert—in a servile idolatry of the monstrous leviathan it creates.¹ When Diderot contemplates a statue of S. Ambrose administering to Theodosius that just and righteous rebuke, which was so honourable alike to the giver and the receiver, and bursts forth into wild invectives against the prelate for such daring; when he thinks, with delight, how pleasantly Frederick of Prussia, or Catherine of Russia, would have cropped the saint's beard and ears for his pains, and told him to have carried his fanaticism and his altars elsewhere;—who can fail to agree with Mrs. Jameson in denouncing such criticism as the narrow and one-sided bigotry of irreligion? Who but must think, with her, 'that if, after 'the slaughter at Ismaël, Catherine of Russia had been placed 'under the ban of Christendom, the world would not have been 'the worse for such an exertion of priestly power.'² Those who imagine, with Diderot, that only a weak emperor could have tamely submitted to the archbishop, will do well to look at the splendid eulogy which the character of Theodosius receives from Gibbon.

We much doubt if any exception can be made to the assertion that religion has in these latter days suffered from the hand of despotism. In China, a part of the prevailing indifference to all that concerns the world unseen, may be traced to the exertions of the Emperors Yao, Chun, and Yu, who, more than two thousand years (it is said) before the Christian era, destroyed the priesthood, making themselves sole Pontiffs;³ and to the irreligious syncretism of the Emperor Hiouen-tsong, who about A. D. 800, mockingly paid equal honour (and, therefore, in reality no true honour) to creeds so different as those of Confucius, Lao-tseu, and Buddha. Such conduct may win approbation from fanatic and Voltairian admirers of China, like the French Orientalist, M. Pauthier, but they only cause regret to those who see how much additional difficulty is thereby placed in the way of Christian Missions among that civilized but unspiritual race. And if we return in thought to Christendom, do the past annals of despotic Spain—does the present condition of the upper classes in despotic Russia—speak well for the effect of despotism upon religion? We must not, of course, lose sight of the many evils in this respect of Great Britain or the United States; but,

¹ Lit. of Europe, vol. iii. cap. iv. § 3. We have mangled, for brevity's sake, a very fine passage.

² Sacred and Legendary Art; S. Ambrose.

³ M. Bazin, in the Preface to Malpiere's *La Chine*, (Paris, 1825.) M. Pauthier (Univers Pittoresque, *La Chine*) makes an earlier emperor than Yao responsible for this change. But this is not important.

on the whole, we should be ready to maintain that a balance may be struck in favour of freedom.

There are many other points which deserve to be taken into consideration by those who would attempt to weigh fairly in the balance the evils and advantages of imperial government. Such are those connected with liberty of thought, with corruption and hypocrisy, with preparation for the enjoyment of freedom. These and some cognate topics will, we trust, receive some slight elucidation in the remaining sections of the present article; it may be well, however, to touch upon them briefly, while the reader's attention is directed to the general question.

The possibility of liberty of thought existing under despotism must greatly depend upon the climate, the race, and the age in which the problem is attempted. We know that such liberty had no place under the majority of the Roman emperors, excepting in so far as the Church by degrees obtained, first, a hearing, and then a triumph. But, at the epoch of the Reformation, several of the reformed countries appear to have presented the singular spectacle of an increase of authority on the part of the princes, together with a great development of licence of thought. M. Guizot, in his '*Civilisation en Europe*,' appeals to Denmark, Germany, Holland, and England, as exemplifications of this apparent anomaly. And, generally, it may be observed that the deprivation of liberty is a severer trial in northern than in southern climates; perhaps, as some have suggested, from the circumstance that mere existence is a greater pleasure in those genial atmospheres than amidst the fogs and long-protracted winters of less-favoured lands. The danger (as it seems to us) to the educated classes, in countries where political liberty of action as well as liberty of thought is interdicted, is, lest they should become mere minions of pleasure, and thus adopt less serious views of life, be less accessible to the influences of religion, than even those who are busied in the strife of politics.

The question of corruption and hypocrisy presents some difficulties. That they are very rife in courts and around despots is undeniable. Tacitus and Juvenal may bear testimony for imperial Rome. Lord Carlisle and Dr. Sandwith can tell of their palmy state under the sway of the Sultan. But we shall have occasion, further onward, to examine whether the Aristotelian charge in this respect, against democracies no less than despotisms, may not likewise be extended to oligarchies and constitutional monarchies.

That despotism can ever be a preparative for freedom, is one of those modern paradoxes which we find it hard to understand. If we may trust M. Nisard, in his reply to the Duc de Broglie's

recent discourse at the Academy, France is in course of time to try the experiment of associating greater liberty with her present form of government. But experience of the past seems to show that the political pendulum has a great tendency to swing with violent alternations from Absolutism to Anarchy, and back again; that too often, in the language of the Laureate,—

‘He that roars for liberty,
Faster binds a tyrant’s power;
And the tyrant’s cruel glee
Forces on the freer hour.

‘Greet her with applause breath,
Freedom, gaily doth she tread;
In her right a civic wreath,
In her left a human head.

‘Let her go! her thirst she slakes
Where the bloody conduit runs:
Then her sweetest meal she makes
On the first-born of her sons.’

It is the fear of that terrible form of freedom which, Saturn-like, devours its own offspring (the expression, if we remember rightly, belongs originally to the Girondist leader, Vergniaud), that makes the nations who have long been used to Imperialism still cling to it; that causes other nations who have tasted anarchy to take refuge in it. Sometimes, perhaps, men would be glad of one who, like a Cincinnatus or a Washington, should restore order and then retire. But such men are among the very rarest; and anarchy is so dreadful, so unnatural (whatever the school of Rousseau may proclaim), that we see not why respect should be refused to great nations who accept this far less trying alternative of autocracy, so but they can learn to accept it in a righteous temper. And as for those countries which prefer to preserve a royalty, which has not sunk into a mere chief magistracy; which regard this regimen not as a mere refuge from evil, but a positive good,—we may learn to own that forms of government do, like most earthly things, present but a balance of benefits and disadvantages—that what is not absolutely best, may often prove relatively best—and that Great Britain need not necessarily denounce every other form of government, however firmly she may adhere to her own as best suited for herself. Wherever Imperialism expresses, upon the whole, better than any other rule, a nation’s heart and mind; wherever, either from the invisible limitations of public opinion, or from the acquiescence brought about by a sense of duty or of interest, or a union of both, or, lastly, through dread of the worse tyranny of Socialism and disorder, a majority prefer such

governance,—*there*, surely, we may safely say, 'Let it flourish so long as it pleaseth God!'

But as we have spoken freely of the nobleness of true loyalty, so let us add that a lurid light appears to be thrown by prophecy upon the possibility of a false loyalty in the latter days. It was certainly the teaching of the early Church—not, of course, as a dogma of the faith, but as the most probable interpretation of prophecy—that, as surely as there were those on earth to whom their fellow-men of right looked up, so, too, were there those who enjoyed power, and fascinated their brethren by the very terrors of wickedness; and that, as all beneficent royalty is sanctioned, embodied, and consecrated in the person of CHRIST, so, too, all lawless tyranny and craft and iniquity should, one day, become incarnate in *the* Anti-Christ. Of the Scriptural evidence for such a belief, this is not the occasion to speak; nor of the unwavering *consensus patrum*; nor of the remarkable resuscitation of this teaching in England, during the present century, by such writers as Bishop Horsley, Dr. S. R. Maitland, and Mr. Chenevix Trench. But it is not alien from this inquiry to observe, how greatly the events of the last seventy years have tended to remove the *onus* of improbability which appeared to rest upon the patristic theory of Anti-Christ. Is it possible, it used to be asked, that any Christian nation should avowedly proclaim itself to be infidel—or that men should rush from anarchy into despotism—or that many new states and kingdoms should be created in the space of a few years—or that one man should be able to issue rapid orders to the whole inhabited world? *We* know that these things are not merely possible, but have actually taken place. *We* know that a great people *did* close their churches, desecrate their altars, and write up over their burial-places that death was an eternal sleep. *We* know that Italy saw the Cisalpine, Ligurian, and Parthenopean Republics, and then became subject to a Viceroy; that Etruria, Wirtemberg, Westphalia, Bavaria, and Hanover, were erected into kingdoms; that a single Emperor made kings of his brothers and brother-in-law; and all this in a *very* few years. Since that date (as has been suggested to us), the invention of steam-ships, of railways, and of the electric telegraph, has made the feasibility of universal sovereignty infinitely greater. Alexander would often have been many months' distance, as Mr. Grote remarks, from parts of his projected empire. *We* have seen a campaign in the Crimea influenced by messages, despatched in a few hours, from a capital three thousand miles away.

And, simply because an Anti-Christ is so possible, we would the more insist on the necessity of attempting to study politics from a religious point of view. Therefore, do we close these

very scattered and imperfect reflections upon Imperialism in general, by venturing to remind the reader how necessary it is that, while (in accordance with God's Word) we render *due* honour to the great ones of earth, it be not such honour as may, in anywise, clash with our homage to the common Lord and Father of all, and obedience to his righteous laws; that, when we cherish their memory, the grateful recollection should arise from our regarding them as ministrants of the Most High, and channels of his blessings to their fellow-men; so that we may never even in thought, with reference to the living or the dead, join in the shout of idolizing flattery which brought down divine vengeance on a king of old, 'because he gave not God the glory.' No less may we be called upon to brave that opposite force of *public opinion*, which is so often but 'the madness of the people.'

If we descend from a general consideration of Imperialism to more particularity, there are two questions of the day which almost force themselves upon our notice. The first is, '*How has France arrived at the adoption of this form of government?*' The second, '*Is it probable and desirable that England should follow the example?*' It would be taking far too much upon ourselves to pretend that we are competent to make answer to these queries: *neque hæc dicere . . . Conamur, tenues grandia*. But some notice and comment upon the works named at the head of this article may be taken, perhaps, as a humble contribution of materials towards the contemplation (we dare not say the solution) of these problems. The work of the Comte Louis de Carné is as naturally associated with the former question, as are those of Mr. Congreve and of the Comte de Montalembert with the latter. And, firstly, then, of M. de Carné.

Those who have even a slight acquaintance with the French historians of the Revolution of 1789, must be aware that a school has arisen in Paris which apologises for every crime therein committed, under the plea of fatal and inevitable necessity. This teaching has never, we are thankful to say, become very popular or influential in England. A slight tinge of its doctrines may, perhaps, be traced in Lord Brougham's *Sketches of the Revolutionary Leaders of France*; and, again, in the '*Historic Fancies*' of the present Lord Strangford. But a blind submission to fatalism is not yet, either in thought or action, one of the faults of Englishmen. Milton called *necessity* the 'tyrant's devilish plea,' and we have not learnt to think its character is improved, when urged as an excuse on behalf of the multitude, instead of an individual despot. Such notions were indignantly repudiated by the writers on the Revolution who are best known

in England, as may be seen by a reference to the pages of Sir A. Alison and Professor Smyth. The latter is especially and justly severe upon the works of M. Mignet and M. de Thiers.¹

Wordsworth found vent for his indignation, *mors suo*, in the composition of three sonnets, which he made public in the latest volume issued before his death. As they are not much known, we may be pardoned for quoting one, and referring our readers to the others, which are equally excellent in tone.

‘Portentous change, when History can appear
As the cool Advocate of foul device;
Reckless audacity extol, and jeer
At consciences perplexed with scruples nice!
They who bewail not, must abhor, the sneer
Born of Conceit, Power’s blind Idolater;
Or haply sprung from vaunting Cowardice,
Betrayed by mockery of holy fear.
Hath it not long been said the wrath of man
Works not the righteousness of God? Oh, bend,
Bend, ye perverse! to judgments from on high,
Laws that lay under Heaven’s perpetual ban,
All principles of action that transcend
The sacred limits of humanity.’

These are sentiments the more remarkable, as coming from one who, in early life, had been so enthusiastically hopeful of the most blessed results arising out of the French Revolution. But if such words expressed the current thoughts of Englishmen, there was no reason to suspect that they represented public feeling in France, or were likely to find their way into the ears and hearts of its inhabitants. There was deep need of some native author of character and ability to utter a warning voice; for, so long as a country glories in its shame, refuses to acknowledge national sins, and urges, as a palliation, the course of destiny—for *that* land there can be no mental health, no true peace for the present, no solid hope of amendment for the future.

It is the glory of Count Louis de Carné, that he has dared to undertake this unpalatable task. In a series of papers originally published in the *Revue des deux Mondes*, and now bound up with some letters in two handsome octavos, he has commented upon

¹ ‘The general effect of the whole representation is, that everything in the way of folly, and fault, and crime, is the result of the operation of general principles, linked together by a sort of invincible necessity, which one may deplore indeed, but which we should in vain endeavour to burst through or prevent. . . . Let him not thus talk of events as if they are inevitable. Reason, and wisdom, and virtue, and everything, human and divine, is at an end upon any such supposition. We have nothing but fate, necessity, and irresistible connexion,

And helpless man, in ignorance sedate,
Rolls darkling down the torrent of his fate.’

Smyth on French Revolution, Lect. XXIII. (Cf. Wordsworth’s second Sonnet, and Alison *passim*.)

the chief phases of French politics since 1789. The historical causes of the great Revolution; society in the eighteenth century; the ideas of '89 and '91 (as those years are familiarly termed in France); the Constitutionalists, Girondists, and Republicans of that epoch; the Reign of Terror, the Directory, and the Consulate; the Empire and the Monarchy of 1815; the Monarchy of 1830, and the Revolution of 1848;—all are considered with great freshness and ability; and, what is more, with admirable candour, and in a religious spirit. In respect of style, our praise must be slightly qualified. We ought, indeed, to speak with diffidence in criticising a foreigner on this head; but those who have even a scanty acquaintance with some of the most famous French authors of the day will probably agree with us, if they make acquaintance with M. de Carné, that his style has not the calm clearness of Guizot, nor the richness of Victor Cousin, nor the attractive brilliancy of De Montalembert, nor the finished dignity and grave satire of Prince Albert de Broglie. Indeed, it is frequently involved; we have to wait at times so long for the nominative case, as to make us fancy that our author has been travelling eastward of the Rhine, and imported into his French a slight dash of contraband Germanism. Nevertheless, though not, perhaps, a model for imitation, M. de Carné's language has merits of its own. It bears the stamp of deep and earnest thought, of courage, frankness, and marked individuality. Imbued with a deep hatred of evil, with a still more intense hatred of sophistical defences of evil, he scatters all the clouds, and bursts into a glow of warmth and light, whenever he feels called upon to mark his reprobation of national offences, or of the flimsy arguments of their apologists.

'Si natura negat, facit indignatio versum.'

M. de Carné's metaphors (and Aristotle makes this a test of genius) are at times extremely grand; and if part of their force be derived from frequent allusions to the sublime imagery of Holy Writ, it is still evident that such reference is not forced, nor sought as a mere ornament of speech; but that it occurs naturally, as the most obvious expression of the writer's meaning.

And yet it must not, therefore, be supposed that these 'Etudes' espouse the cause of some extreme political party. On the contrary, it has been justly observed that M. de Carné does not, with Count Joseph de Maistre, consider the revolution simply Satanic, nor, with M. Buchez, call it a new Gospel. In his own words, despite the temptation to wholesale praise or condemnation, *la révolution n'est pourtant ni une panacée ni une boîte de Pandore*. The merits of the work, in this as in other

respects, have obtained for it a highly flattering notice from Prince Albert de Broglie; and the opening pages of his critique may, perhaps, amuse as well as interest the reader. (We translate from the '*Revue des deux Mondes*' of February, 1855.)

'I have always rather envied men who have adopted, and who profess, extreme opinions. In times of uncertainty like ours, nothing, one imagines, can be so convenient; nothing can abolish so many doubts and scruples. When a man is so fortunate as to possess, either in philosophy or politics, a well-defined system which he follows out unshrinkingly, in all its consequences; when he feels perfectly certain that he holds the truth wholly, without limitation and without alloy; when, in consequence of this, he is brought to persuade himself that any other view can only proceed from incorrigible extravagance, or from interested falsehood,—he must draw from this complacency towards himself, and disdain of others, a great amount of mental repose. Persons thus constituted have found a way of placing themselves truly above the strokes of fate and the struggles of conscience. Every event confirms them in their opinion—the triumph, as well as the defeat, of their party. They have always an interpretation ready made, at the service of all occurrences. When the fortune of revolutions is against them, it becomes in their eyes a blind chance, often aiding intrigue and ambition; but if it should prove favourable to them, they see in it, unhesitatingly, the inexorable justice of the Divine hand, or the irresistible force of truth. No deception discourages them—no argument shakes them; they do not in the least require to know how things proceed, in order to be able to talk of them. Sure that no good exists amongst their opponents, they deem it perfectly useless to inquire what is said by them or what is thought. The study of history, especially, is for them as short as it is simple; for they find no problems to solve, no inconsistencies to reconcile. All is right on a particular side—all is wrong on the other. What perplexes and troubles minds less sure of themselves—those dark shadows which often disfigure the noblest causes—those vices and passions which human corruption will enlist even in defence of truth—nothing of all this concerns or arrests them. Cruelty is always justice when committed by their friends, whilst legitimate defence on the part of their adversaries is always fanaticism or persecution. All this is told you commonly in a quiet, derisive tone, without hesitation, but without anger; for a man is but little irritated when he is not at all shaken. Formerly a little drawing-room treatise was written on the happiness of fools; without comparison, I would willingly make one on the happiness that narrow dogmatical minds enjoy in a sceptical society.

'Next to this kind of privileged nature, the one that seems to me best adapted to promote happiness is a perfectly opposite disposition. To have but one single idea in the head, and but one feeling in the heart, is undoubtedly the best; if this cannot be attained, the best thing to be done is to take all ideas and all feelings either simultaneously or successively. To avoid vexations in this world, if one cannot be very narrow, one must be extremely comprehensive; if one cannot be very rigid, one must be very supple. To comprehend and admit almost everything; to take a place, obligingly, at the point of view of all parties, with indulgent and, if requisite, admiring intelligence; to find a good reason for all facts, an explanation of all actions, nay even for all crimes; to have no personal conviction; to be a warm partisan for the time, if the convictions of those amongst whom we live, or of the heroes whose history we read, as a wave reflects all the colours of the sky:—this is a less worthy, less haughty, but still a tolerably easy, mode of getting through these our days of doubts

and discouragements. And if you can add to this a certain tact in foreseeing the reactions of public opinion, of guessing what sentiment will be the fashion on the morrow, so as to make a few steps towards it in time, and to trim your sail to the right side for the coming breeze, that mental gift, well managed, may prove as profitable as it is agreeable.¹

The critic proceeds to contrast with these easy lines of thought the hard and ungracious labour of those who attempt to reconcile conflicting opinions, to combine fixity of principle with freedom from exclusiveness, to listen to the ideas suggested by others without resigning their own, and join firmness of opinion with some degree of moderation in its expression. And while M. Albert de Broglie differs from M. de Carné in one or two points (at which we may glance presently), he cheerfully recognises these merits, and even more than these, and adds that the work is worthy of the political career of the author, as an *ancien député*.¹

A rapid glance at some of the main positions of the work will show how well calculated it is to interest those who are fond of the subjects which it handles, and to throw light upon the points of discussion here suggested. In many respects our author arrives at conclusions very similar to those of Smyth and Alison. As he is a very independent thinker, such agreement may at first sight cause surprise. M. de Carné is French, they are British; he is a statesman, they are historians; he has been trained in the Roman Catholic, they in the English, communion. What is there to lead them to any conclusions in common? The key is simple. All three are sincere believers in the Christian truth of God's moral government of the world: all three hold that, while the chastisement of the sins of individual men is frequently reserved for the world to come, the sins of corporate bodies receive their retribution here. Smyth implies this rule; Alison states it explicitly, after the fashion of Lord Lindsay in his 'Progression of Antagonism.' How completely, in this leading principle, M. de Carné is identified with them, may be judged from the very first words of his preface:—

'In studying the French Revolution in its most varied phases, I have been particularly struck with one thing; and that is, the promptitude with which principles have always wrought their consequences, and the immediate connexion of sufferings with faults. Whether unheard-of crimes have been followed by unexampled expiations, or baffled hopes have succeeded to the inebriation of confidence and pride, in each case is made manifest a direct relation between causes and effects, between the ruin of parties and the passions which provoked it.

'The poet of "Paradise Lost" proposed as his aim, the glorification of

¹ M. de Carné, who was born at Quimper, in Brittany, in 1804, is of a family of high position in that province. He was trained to diplomacy under Charles X. and held high offices of state under Louis Philippe. He was always with the Church party on the education question.

Providence, and the justification of God's ways before men. [M. de Carné here cites, in a note, the famous lines of Milton,—

"That to the height of this great argument
I may assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."]

“Such, likewise, must assuredly be the mission (whether they know it themselves, or are ignorant of it) of the historians of the Revolution; for assuredly there never was an epoch in which lofty justice from on high has been more visibly displayed, or in which nations have more evidently created their own destinies.”

It is not part of M. de Carné's task to give the history of the reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XV. These may be studied in the celebrated memoirs of the Duc de Saint-Simon, the recently-discovered work of M. Barbier, and in the ‘Life of Beaumarchais,’ lately given to the world by M. de Loménie. Certainly, some such work as the last is needed by him who would obtain a just idea of the moral and political corruption which preceded that volcanic outburst. Count Louis looks more closely, though not exclusively, to the strictly political causes; and, amongst these, points to the long struggle which had been waged in France against feudality. With an aristocracy of caste, originating in conquest, our author has not much more sympathy than Dr. Arnold; like Arnold, he can sympathise with the mediæval popes in their early struggles against the Empire, as embodying feudality. Following in the wake of the lamented M. Augustin Thierry, in his ‘Essai sur l'Histoire du Tiers Etat,’ M. de Carné shows the gradual, but decided and unrelaxing, efforts of the *bourgeoisie* to attain that civil equality in the eye of the law which the Constituent Assembly at length won for them. He shows how monarchs and great ministers, as Henry IV., Richelieu, Louis XIV., either openly, or virtually, took part with the citizens against the *noblesse*. He shows, though this point comes out perhaps still more vividly in other works, (as, *e.g.*, in Madame de Sevigné's Letters,) how the nobles played into this policy, by their disregard of rural life, their want of self-respect, their willingness to make position depend more upon the office held at court, than upon their own social condition and descent. In truth, Louis XIV. has been justly termed *that great leceller*; he hated birth, he hated talents, if they presumed to be independent of himself. He wished that every ray of light should seem to emanate from him, as from a sun; and his success in attaining this cherished end was certainly remarkable. The Duc de Saint-Simon was an exception to the general rule; *he* did take his stand upon his peerage, and his personal worth and attainments; but it is wonderful, if we look at that galaxy of talent around Louis, given some pages back, to see how little

independence *did* exist. Even those great preachers, marvellous as they were, can they be acquitted (despite some bold passages) of fulsome praise of Louis on the one hand, of very great reticence and abstinence from righteous rebuke upon the other? An earnest French Protestant *pasteur*, M. Bungener, declares indeed that after much study of the epoch, he thinks Louis a better man than is generally imagined. It may be so; we do not stop to argue the point: but the fact of his having ruled as he did, and of that rule having been so accepted by the French nation, if at one time it led by reaction to anarchy, was certainly a lesson, both for rulers and ruled, as to the means of re-establishing and consolidating Imperialism.

We must not dwell upon those scenes in the earlier history which M. de Carné, no less than Sir F. Palgrave among ourselves, considers almost typical of the events of 1789. Neither can we find space to consider the effects produced by the writings of Montesquieu, of whom our author considers M. Guizot to be the legitimate descendant in spirit, as clearly as Louis Blanc is a son of Rousseau. But on one marked and leading feature of these volumes we must dwell for a few moments.

The work of the great revolution was twofold—partly social, partly political. On its political achievements the different parties in France—Legitimists, Orleanists, Buonapartists, and Republicans—are still at variance. But on its social results,—the overthrow of feudality and primogeniture, and the creation of civil equality, equality of taxation, &c.—there is a far more general agreement than one might expect to find. MM. Thiers, L. de Carné, Albert de Broglie, and a hundred more, coincide in not merely accepting, but thoroughly approving, this side of the change. Such approval is perfectly intelligible on the part of democrats and imperialists. Neither a president nor an emperor need necessarily wish to see around him descendants of old families possessed of large territorial property. But we do not understand this feeling when displayed by the supporters of constitutional monarchy; and those who cherish it must have notions of liberty different from those entertained in England. Mr. Cobden published a few years since a clever pamphlet, entitled '1793 and 1853.' We venture to think that its pages contain a collection of half-truths, and half-truths only. But as we have already quoted from it with approbation a passage concerning the power of the Emperor of the French, so too may we observe that nowhere, within our knowledge, is this distinction between the French and English ideas of liberty so clearly and acutely pointed out. Englishmen, while they enjoy the *habeas corpus* and the freedom of the press, are not annoyed by the

circumstance that one man possesses half a county. Frenchmen, so long as they remain secure from any privileged inequality in the social system, seem willing to part with all the defences which might secure their personal freedom.

The question of primogeniture, then, lies at the very root of our differences. We are well aware that the feeling against it is not novel, nor confined to France alone. Gavelkind (for which the Kentish men struggled successfully against William I.) obtained, says Blackstone, among the Britons, was agreeable to the Roman law, and continued among the Saxons till the Norman conquest. Hallam tells us of German princes in the sixteenth century, who denounced curses upon any of their posterity who should introduce the 'inipious custom of primogeniture.' And attempts to revive it in modern Prussia have failed as completely as in modern France. Indeed, M. de Carné declares that the system of entails *can* only be preserved in countries which, like England, have colonial offices, and places in the army and navy, and in the Established Church, sufficiently well paid to attract and partially support the cadets of noble families. Our limits compel us to suggest, rather than to grapple with, these difficulties. But, although M. de Carné points to Belgium, Holland, and Sardinia, as examples of constitutional government without entailed estates, we join with a host of Englishmen, and with at least one distinguished Frenchman (M. de Montalembert) in doubting whether any *large* country can destroy the *droit d'aînesse* without becoming a despotism or a democracy.

M. de Carné, however, as we have intimated, is so far grateful to the men of '89; he thinks that they had got hold of Christian ideas, but unhappily were not prepared to carry them out in a spirit of truly philosophic and Christian statemanship. Assuredly not: a glance at his pictures of the society of that day would be enough to convince us of that. Here, for instance, is the portrait of the *bourgeoisie*: '*Elle s'était faite 'rationnaliste avec Rousseau, impie avec Diderot, et cynique avec 'Voltaire.*' He proceeds to expand this sentence:—'The generation, which was about to receive the mission of giving a definite form to the work of its ancestors, read "*la Pucelle*" on 'the eve of its entrance into public life. It had studied political 'science in the "*Contrat Social*," and philosophy in the "*Esquisse 'de l'Histoire du Progrès de l'Esprit humain*"; and the sentimental naturalism of Bernardin de Saint-Pierre occupied the 'place of religious belief.' This sketch is, we all know, but too true; and those who differ, as politicians, on the subject of social freedom, may well agree, as Christians, in despairing of the regeneration of the human race whenever and wherever it is

taken in hand by such a body of men as the French citizens of '89.

Of the personal character of the clergy, M. de Carné thinks more favourably than most authors; and recent inquiries seem to justify his view. But he observes that, as a body, they had applauded the savage conduct of Louis XIV. when he hunted his Protestant subjects, and imposed a faith as if it were an affair of royal ordinance; that during the regency they suffered the infamous Dubois to be consecrated as successor to Fenelon without a murmur; that they maintained a most culpable silence during the enormous wickednesses of the reign of Louis XV; that they displayed, throughout the eighteenth century, a lack alike of charity and wisdom; and allowed the sacred lamp of knowledge—one of the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit of truth—to pass into the hands of their enemies. Charges these the more serious and impressive, when it is remembered that they are made by an earnest Roman Catholic of evidently ultramontane tendencies.

M. de Carné does not wish to see the French Church again possessed of high station and great political power. But of the manner in which it was despoiled of its goods and its influence, he speaks with a power which of itself would serve to mark him for a thinker and writer of no ordinary stature. Passing by many other passages of equal force and solemnity, we give the following as a specimen of our author's best manner. *We are responsible for the italics:—*

'Political crimes rarely inspire contempt, because they spring from the shock of parties, like the lightning from the region of storms; but when an assembly, after having solemnly proclaimed individual freedom and liberty of conscience, is seen to attack, without any provocation, without the smallest interest, what twenty millions of men hold nearest and dearest; when it tortures souls, crushes existences, pronounces the annihilation (*exheredation*) of all rights, soon followed by terrible penalties against thousands of despairing and inoffensive citizens; when it assumes tyrannical powers in order to impose upon a nation the fancies of its own thought, and the corruptions of its own heart, one feels a bitter disdain for human nature, mingled with a strange feeling of religious terror. *It seems as if one were in the presence of one of those great crimes against the Spirit which are not forgiven unto nations, and one feels sweep by one in the atmosphere the near breath of the vengeance of God.*

'Never, perhaps, was chastisement so instantaneous, nor expiation so terrible. The Constituent Assembly, and almost the entire *bourgeoisie*, found themselves suddenly engaged, by the very resistance organized in all quarters of the country, in a series of violent measures which rendered inevitable the accession of the revolutionary democracy to power. Logical (*conséquente*) in its work of oppression, the Assembly decreed that every priest who should refuse to pledge his faith to the new ecclesiastical constitution, should, on the refusal of the oath, *ipso facto*, be deprived of his functions, and immediately replaced.

'They imagined that they would only have to encounter isolated resist-

ances, over which they would easily triumph by misery and intimidation; consequently, they experienced extreme disappointment on finding themselves suddenly in opposition to a clergy all but unanimous, and masses of people excited and shortly afterwards insurgent.'—Pp. 136, 137.

It is gratifying to remember that the mind of England at once perceived that this was an attack, not upon Rome, but upon Christianity. Burke and Mackintosh, Bishop Horsley and the eloquent Baptist preacher, Robert Hall, were here all of one mind, unanimous in their condemnation.

Having implied our disagreement with portions of Mr. Cobden's pamphlet, we must state one in connexion with M. de Carné. One leading object of the pamphlet on '1793 and 1853,' is to throw the *whole* of the blame of that great war which was ended at Waterloo, upon England. It is implied throughout that all Frenchmen are of this opinion, and that Englishmen who study the case with fairness must ultimately adopt the same conclusion. We trust that, without discourtesy or improper personality, we may be allowed to question the universality of this opinion on the part of our neighbours, and now (happily) allies. M. Charles de Remusat, in a recent and very laudatory article upon Fox, yet admitted, that 'France had declared herself the ally of all the nations who wished to overthrow their governments.'¹ The opinion of Count L. de Carné, who does not overflow with love towards England, may be judged from the following passages:—

'The great crime (*l'attentat*) of the 21st of January [the execution of Louis XVI.] drove to arms the cabinets most firmly bent upon peace. France took the initiative of a deadly war against all nations, being at as much pains to increase the number of her enemies, as it would have seemed natural for her to take to diminish them.'—*Preface*.

'The French Revolution had been pacific at its opening, like every idea which when ushered into the world believes itself strong enough to win the mastery; but, embittered by obstacles, it had soon imputed to others difficulties of which the greater part had been created by itself. *It had accused and menaced Europe*, whatever was the sympathy with which certain governments had welcomed this first application of the Encyclopedist doctrines, whatever the reserve with which the others had shown their disapprobation or their doubts. At the first period of the Revolution, the idea of an armed intervention was intensely repugnant to the principal European governments.'—Tome i., pp. 168, 169.

Is not this a very different tone from that of the pamphlet in question, which represents the contest as being, on the part of the allies, 'a war *so evidently unprovoked and aggressive?*' If it be said that this distinguished senator gives facts to justify his conclusion, 'that whatever faults or crimes may be fairly chargeable upon the French nation for the excesses and cruelties of the Revolution up to this time (April, 1792), it cannot be with justice made responsible for the commencement of the war,'

¹ *Revue des deux Mondes* (1^{er} Janvier, 1856).

let it be observed that M. de Carné, a few pages onwards, gives his array of counter-facts to prove the contrary, and adds, 'these facts defy all contradiction, and enable us to decide whether it was Europe that attacked the French Revolution, or the Revolution that attacked Europe.' Far be it from us to suppose that in such mighty movements *all* the faults can be laid upon one side only; but it really is of importance that when the conduct of England is condemned *in toto* by certain of her own sons, we should know the judgment of so gifted, so candid a Frenchman as Count Louis de Carné.

These remarks cannot fairly be esteemed a digression; for if France was, we will not say *entirely*, but something more than half-responsible for the great European struggle, her conduct in this respect was one of the chief preparations for what Burke foresaw so early—a military despotism. But a little onward we arrive, in the work before us, at a vivid picture of the intense misery of Paris, followed by an exclamation of gratitude to Dumouriez and the army, which reminds us of language we ourselves heard at a later date in the French capital. 'If the independence of our territory was preserved, France ought to render thanks, after God, to that religion of the banner which in the heart of her noble children survives all catastrophes, and by which nations preserve, amidst the most humiliating trials, self-respect and the germ of a future.' 'Society,' said a Parisian banker to us in the autumn of 1848, 'society at present only lives upon the army.'

We pass over our author's scourging condemnation of those writers who have dared to apologise for the massacres of September, his proof that France gained nothing by such wickedness, his declaration that the national conscience has probably been more injured by the sophistry of palliation than by the very crimes themselves. But to those who delight to see such sophisms torn to very shreds, and thrown to the four winds of heaven, we commend the reply of M. de Carné to the representation of M. de Lamartine on behalf of the Girondists in the matter of the death of Louis XVI. That eloquent writer tries to excuse his heroes on the ground that events had come to such a pass that *one* must be overthrown—Louis or the party of the Gironde; that they were compelled to sacrifice the king that they themselves might not be hurled from power.

For such reasoning (though, indeed, it is an abuse of terms to call it *reasoning*) M. de Carné has no mercy. He proves it to be as false in point of fact as it is hollow and wretched in sentiment. He calls it the most signal falsehood which has ever been introduced into a political narrative; adding that the Girondists were overthrown by this judicial murder (*ce meurtre*

juridique), and that it decided the conduct of countries that were yet in doubt what course to take.

Very striking is the inquiry which follows into the theory of *Jacobinism*, and the references to Milton and to Dante, which seem to rush into the writer's mind, as the Pandemonium of the terrible club is brought before his consideration. The abolition of the state of matrimony by the Jacobins, their hatred of intellect (which no less than wealth disturbed their dream of equality), their judicial blindness, are all touched with a masterly hand. One use for posterity he does recognise in that monument raised to the glory of the Jacobins, the 'Parliamentary History of the Revolution,' by Messieurs Buchez and Roux. 'The work of the two writers, who have collected the most overwhelming proofs against the men for whom they dare to claim the respect of future generations, recalls the mission of that people to whom God committed the guardianship of all the records which condemn it, and which carries a torch to enlighten the world, while itself remains in darkness.' And presently there occurs another passage of almost sublime awfulness, which exhibits with wonderful force the spiritual generation and descent of the men of action from the men of thought. M. de Carné maintains—and the idea does not to us seem strained or fanciful—that Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau sat in spirit on the benches of the Convention:—

'In the dark precincts where so many passions roar, where hatred alone dilates men's souls, and sorrow contracts them; on the benches of that formidable Convention which strikes with death whatever it touches, do you not distinguish three figures which, in the preceding age, have already received, and indeed, as it were, exhausted the homage and the untiring admiration of the world? Who is that man, of studied speech and pitiless laugh, who uses his wit as a dagger, and prepares by *bons mots* the work of the murderers? It is, perchance, Camille Desmoulins, but assuredly it is also Voltaire; it is Voltaire grown young again, come down from his pedestal in the wall, and speaking to the people his elegant and cruel language; it is Voltaire covering his work of desolation with the rich, cold ornaments of his style. In that powerful demagogue, with his rugged figure, with his sensual imagination and habits, whose head and heart drag him from the extremity of crime to the extremity of pity; in that man who, at the peril of his life, bends beneath the benediction of a priest at the entreaty of a young girl, to return the next moment to the fanaticism of annihilation, do you not recognise Diderot as well as Danton? What shall we say of that rhetorician, consumed by hatred, and shrunk with envy, who conceals, under an array of arrogant vulgarisms, the poverty of his thoughts? That inexhaustible talker, who makes the existence of God and the immortality of the soul the props of his dictatorship, almost as his master made them the themes of eloquent periods to crush his opponents, the philosophers—that proud and solitary man, who makes all revelation consist in a supreme adoration of himself—is he not the son, a very degenerate one I grant, but only too easily recognised, of that writer whose metaphysic vein nourished a whole generation? The most cruel chastisement of Rousseau is to have given birth to Robespierre, and the

test of the political opinions of the author of 'Emile' is the application of them attempted by the sanguinary triumvir. Robespierre was the obstinate and conscientious worker out of the doctrines built upon the triple foundation of natural religion, primordial contract, and the native excellence of humanity, such as they appear in every page of Rousseau's writings; and the master must be answerable for the disciple.

'They were, then, so to speak, personally present at that solemn trial of their wisdom; those doctors who had so long shaken France, and who in the infinite variety of their thoughts had agreed together to extinguish in the heart of man the Divine inbreathing which helped it to live! On those benches there crowded the pupils they had formed, in those tribunes were the public they had created. The female philosophers and the academic wits had passed from the *petits soupers* of the *fermiers généraux*, and from the *salons* of Madame de Pompadour to the greasy *cortège* of Chaumette, and the apostate Gobel translated into the vulgar tongue the witty blasphemies that had so long charmed the court and the town.'—Tome i., pp. 246-248.

And then, after an energetic description of Paris under Robespierre,—which he represents as worse than even Rome under Nero; after a description of men reeking with the carnage of Lyons and Bourdeaux, engaged in carrying with impious solemnities the remains of Marat to the Pantheon; our author sums up this part of his narrative with these impressive, perhaps we may say golden, words:—

'When such horrors have been displayed in the face of the universe, and an entire generation of writers has found belief, when it has pretended to transform these shameful times into an era of masculine courage, there cannot be for a country (let us be well assured of it) expiations long enough, trials sufficiently severe. *Whether a nation undergo the torture of anarchy, or the humiliation of despotism, it ought to confess before God and man that it has deserved them all.*

In laying before our readers such extracts from a work which has not, we believe, as yet been noticed by any portion of the English press, we trust that we may not even appear to minister, far less actually to minister, to any sentiments of unholy national pride. England has her own sins to answer for and lament: *non nobis, Domine*, must be our heartfelt acknowledgment if we have hitherto been spared the fiery ordeals undergone by France during the last seventy years. But, in truth, we do not regard such sentences as the above as in anywise degrading to the spirit of a great people. Hideous crimes, followed by wretched sophistical palliations, nay, by endeavours to exalt and glorify guilt,—these are the real sources of disgrace alike to individuals and to nations. But there is nothing degrading in repentance, nothing shameful in confession. It is while in the far country the prodigal devours his father's living with harlots, and is joined to a citizen of the godless land, and craves the food of swine, that he is unworthy to be called a son; not when (in the marvellous fulness of that divine expression) he *has come to himself*, and confesses, in the face of heaven and his brethren, his sin and its desert of chastisement. It is in the

utter repudiation of the vain-glorious narratives like those of M. Thiers, and in the thorough acceptance of such admissions as M. de Carné's, that there lies the best hope of the future for France, and for every other nation likewise, in so far as it has sinned like her.

It is some relief to change the scene. We pass over the earlier portion of the chapter *On the Dissolution of Society*, and hasten to the wonderful achievement of its re-construction. That achievement was, under Providence, simply and solely the work of one man. And whatever judgment be passed upon the subsequent career of Napoleon Buonaparte, whatever condemnation be uttered on the despotism of his rule at home, especially in the miseries of the Conscription, or the crushing and desolating misery produced by his conquests abroad, the voice of history will never falter in speaking of his domestic policy during the era of his Consulate. The reconciliation of the order of the *old régime* with the changed phases of society under the *new*; the profound insight into human nature, and more particularly French nature; the consummate tact with which all was attained that could be ventured upon, and nothing attempted that was hopeless; the promulgation of a Code which now gives the law to nearly half of Europe; the overthrow of irreligion; the pacification of La Vendée—the accomplishment of all this in a few years, under difficulties and novelties of position such as scarcely any legislator of ancient or modern times has had to cope with; this is beyond doubt one of the highest works of genius which the world has ever seen. Nor can it create reasonable surprise if many inhabitants of Paris in that day, who had lost all hope of preserving anything but life, and were but too well aware of the instability of that humble hope itself, were afterwards unable (we have known such) to judge calmly of the after-deeds of one who, whatever he had proved to others, had to them been a liberator and a saviour.

An outline of the history of the Consulate was dictated by Napoleon to Montholon at St. Helena; and eloquent as it is, we are bound to acknowledge that its main force arises from its truth. The leading feature,—the adjustment of the claims of two conflicting generations,—has been touched, with his usual felicity; by Manzoni, in a single stanza of that noble ode, *Il Cinque Maggio* :—

' He came: two rival ages
Arm'd 'gainst each other stood;
To him they turn'd submissively,
As waiting for his nod:
Silence he bade, and arbiter
Sate down the twain above.'¹

¹ ' Ei si nomò: due secoli
L'un contro l'altro armato,

And when the present Emperor (at that time Prince President of the Republic) inaugurated at Lyons the equestrian statue of his uncle, he virtually, though perhaps unconsciously, translated the Italian poetry into French prose.

M. de Carné falls short of no admirer of Napoleon in his estimate of this portion of his eventful career. He declares that his native land has, of all countries, owed the most to its great men. 'La France a-t-elle fait un seul pas important dans le cours de ses destinées sans qu'un nom propre ne resplendisse au frontispiece d'une ère nouvelle? A-t-elle jamais été sauvée sans que la voix du pays entier n'ait acclamé son sauveur?' Charlemagne, Louis IX., Du Guesclin, Joan of Arc, Henri IV., Richelieu—such is his selection of names connected with the salvation of their country; and a very striking list it is, if we pause over it but for a moment's contemplation. With these our author would enrol the First Consul of 1799; whom he considers marked with the twofold seal impressed upon the brow of men raised up by Providence, inasmuch as his rôle was at once most unlooked for and most necessary.

We say the Consul, for on the Emperor our critic looks with a different eye. He considers the entire scope and spirit of the Empire to be something different from that of the Consulate. We have not room to discuss the differences, on this head, between MM. de Carné and de Broglie. The latter, though no Buonapartist, regards the policy of the Empire as the natural development of the first seizure of power resultant from the famous 18th of *Brumaire*. It might, we imagine, be possible to find a *mezzo termine* between these opposite views; to recognise, with M. de Carné, considerable differences of outward manifestation, while believing, with M. Albert de Broglie, that the moving spirit underwent but little change. But this is one of the many topics which must be left to the judgment of the reader.

Nor have we space to follow our guide through his criticisms upon the period of the Empire. How far the restoration of Poland might have been possible, and, if possible, wise; how utterly 'the continental system' ruined Napoleon's power; how the servility of his courtiers naturally resulted in their base desertion and treachery at Fontainebleau in 1814; how barren (as has been observed) was this epoch of works of genius: these points are all handled by M. de Carné, and though occasionally more from a French point of view than is natural to us, yet always with freshness and ingenuity. A poetess of our own

Sommessi a lui si volsero
Come aspettando il fato:
Ei fe' silenzio, et arbitro
S'assise in mezzo a lor.'

land, who, though rather hard upon the Allies, has treated the theme with great power and stateliness, has expressed one leading sentiment of this part of M. de Carné's work. Some of our readers will recognise the following lines from Elizabeth Browning's 'Crowned and Buried':—

'For, verily, though France augustly rose
With that raised NAME, and did assume by such
The purple of the world, none gave so much
As she in purchase—to speak plain, in loss—
Whose hands, to freedom stretched, dropped paralyzed
To wield a sword, or fit an undersized
King's crown to a great man's head. And though along
Her Paris' streets did float on frequent streams
Of triumph, pictured or enmarbled dreams,—
Dreamt right by genius in a world gone wrong—
No dream, of all so won, was fair to see
As the lost vision of her liberty.'

Her fitness for that liberty France has yet, alas! to prove. Her willingness to resign it must not, however, be wholly assigned to the dread of anarchy. There is there, as in other countries, a school of thinkers who sincerely believe in absolutism as best fitted for the nation; and we have seen the representatives of two of the noblest loyalist families of France, a De la Pastoret and a La Rochejaquelin, desert the cause of Henri of Bourdeaux for that of Louis Napoleon, because the former was pledged to constitutional government. And further, the French nation (in many respects so like the Athenian) does certainly sympathise heartily with the doctrine of Pericles, that it is better for a state to prosper collectively, though individuals may suffer, than that its single members should prosper, while the body politic is undone.¹ It is the proud consciousness that France occupied the foremost place at the recent Conferences,² that reconciles so many to the loss of personal importance under the existing dynasty. It was a similar feeling (and though it may be misdirected, it is in itself high and honourable) which induced them to bear the absolutism of Napoleon.

'He was a despot—granted;
But the *aïr* of his autocratic mouth
Said yea i' the people's French: he magnified
The image of the freedom he denied.
And if they asked for rights, he made reply,
"Ye have my glory!"—and so, drawing round them
His ample purple, glorified and bound them
In an embrace that seemed identity.
He ruled them like a tyrant—true! but none
Were ruled like slaves. Each felt, Napoleon.'

¹ Thucydides, ii. 60.

² This article was sent to press in June last, though too late for our July Number.

How wonderfully the captivity of S. Helena, and his death in the distant island, served Napoleon's memory, and the cause of those who clung to the possible re-appearance of his dynasty, we need not stay to remark. Such an effect was prophesied by himself; it has been sung by poets, and commented on by British historians, and by M. de Carné in these volumes; but by none, perhaps, so faithfully and eloquently as by M. de Lamartine. The judgments of men, more especially of Englishmen, would have been far less lenient had he perished in the zenith of his power. Such is the almost mysterious effect of dethronement and suffering, of anything like expiation for the past.

The verdict of M. de Carné upon Napoleon is, perhaps, occasionally more gentle than we usually, even since the commencement of the *entente cordiale*, form upon this side of the Channel. But his sympathies are only partially with the Emperor; and we are not on our side unmindful of the next stanza which follows those already cited from our gifted songstress:—

'I do not praise this man: the man was flawed
For Adam—much more Christ!—his knee, unbent—
His hand unclean—his aspiration, pent
Within a sword-sweep, pshaw! but since he had
The genius to be loved, why let him have
The justice to be honoured in his grave.'

In arriving at the period of the Restoration, it is easy to see that M. de Carné writes in a more sympathising tone than in any other portion of his 'Etudes.' We do not know that the general impression differs from that given by any ordinary history of the time. There is the clever Louis XVIII., perfectly conscious of the changed times with which he has to deal; the emigrant nobles, perfectly unconscious (*ils n'ont rien oublié, ils n'ont rien appris*, as Talleyrand too truly said); the great English Duke, with his immense influence exercised, as our author grants, with as much moderation as firmness;¹ and, finally, the opposition, to the last degree unscrupulous and ungenerous in its tactics. It is to this last circumstance that our author attributes the failure of constitutional government in France. Instead of political parties there were factions, and the opposition has always aimed at the overthrow rather than the attainment of power. A lamentable confession! but one which seems but too well warranted by facts. We have heard of railway bills being thrown out in the Chamber of Deputies, purely and solely

¹ 'Le duc de Wellington, qui avait hérité du patronage exercé par l'empereur Alexandre en 1814, et dont l'honorable rôle dans ces jours difficile mériterait d'être apprécié avec plus de justice, donnait surtout ces conseils de modération avec l'autorité qui s'attachait au plénipotentiaire victorieux du plus grand Etat constitutionnel.'—Tome ii. p. 33.

because they had been brought forward by the ministry of the day. Now, that the Blues should denounce a new lamp-post because it had been put up by the Buffs, in Mr. Dickens's Borough of Eatanswill, is ludicrous enough; but that the first assembly of a great kingdom should display such weakness is truly pitiable. It makes us hesitate over our author's denial, on behalf of his country, of the statement, that *la monarchie représentative . . . est incompatible avec notre génie*.

M. de Carné is not a Legitimist. He is opposed to the theory of a direct *jus divinum* in royalty; he does not think that France is in want of a territorial aristocracy; he proves that, in a number of respects, Charles X. and his adherents most fatally mistook the clock. But he does full justice to the Royalist party, in whom he recognises one characteristic almost, as he observes, worth all the missing qualities, namely, deep and unflinching sincerity; he does full justice to the monarch who, though inferior both to his predecessor and his successor as a politician, was probably superior to both as a man. Indeed, it is this comparison of his personal character with that of Louis XVIII., and still more Louis Philippe, that lends meaning to those touching lines on his memory by Jean Réboul, the baker-poet of Nismes:—

' O mon vieux Roi, dans ton exil attends,
Chaque jour te luit plus favorable;
Quand la justice est la fille du temps,
Son jugement en est plus équitable.

' Le caillou peut briser un vase d'or;
Mais ses débris, dispersés sur la terre,
A tous les yeux sont précieux encore,
Et le caillou reste une vile pierre.'

In criticising the events of 1830, which made Louis Philippe *Roi des Français* (though not *Roi de France*), and brought the *bourgeoisie* into the possession of power, M. de Carné considers that the victors made a great mistake in departing from the elder line. He thinks that the acceptance of the hereditary right would have been in every way better for themselves, better for the country at large. But he more than palliates the conduct of King Louis Philippe in accepting the crown, and, on the whole, much raises both the monarch and his policy in our estimation.

Nevertheless, it is from this portion of Count L. de Carné's work that Prince Albert de Broglie most seriously dissents. That account of *the monarchy of the barricades*, which to us appears if anything too favourable, falls short of his idea of its real excellence. Now, we always listen with respect to any opinion enunciated by M. Albert de Broglie; but for once we see reasons to distrust his power of forming an equitable judgment. It is no discredit to him, quite the reverse, if filial piety

tends in some degree to warp his sentiments. That the son and heir of the Duc de Broglie should think well of a sovereignty which his father was so instrumental in creating; that he should cherish the memory of a king whom that father served so faithfully, as President of the Council and Prime Minister, is only right and natural. But we are not the less of opinion that M. de Carné's views are the more correct. *He* too loved and served that monarchy; but, even during its existence, he showed his sense of its shortcomings in a series of letters, which he now appends to the volumes before us.

If we speak freely of such as appear to us the weak points of that rule, we utterly and entirely disclaim the charge of having formed our opinion since its fall. (Indeed, our judgment is, in consequence of the study of M. de Carné, more favourable than that which we had formed in 1845.) Neither do we intend to refer to personal failings, undue love of money, undue love of popularity, and the like, which are illustrated so fully (very probably *over-illustrated*) in Mr. Raikes's Journal. But the grand defect *in limine* of the Orleans monarchy was surely this, that it did not appeal to either of those broad principles upon which alone kingship can depend. Indefeasible hereditary right, or the call of the nation,—either of these claims are clear and intelligible. But it always seemed plain to our minds, and M. de Carné entirely confirms the view, that Louis Philippe's election was a compromise, and not strictly tenable on either theory. 'La monarchie de 1830,' writes M. de Carné, 'n'est sortie d'aucun principe; elle n'appartient pas plus à la souveraineté du peuple qu'à celle de la tradition héréditaire; ce fut un œuvre de transaction entre des combattants qui se redoutaient les uns les autres.'

On the faults of that fallen dynasty we do not wish to dwell. Many hints of its weaknesses may be found in Dr. Wordsworth's 'Diary in France,' (which we the rather mention, because the truth of its foreboding tone has hardly had justice done to it), no less than in the pages of M. de Carné. But the latter is likewise its eulogist, and he is not its only eulogist. Whatever be thought of the Duc de Broglie's portraiture of the present ruler of France (and we confess that, in our humble opinion, it is excessively one-sided and unfair), there can be but one opinion, we imagine, in England, concerning that portion of his address to the Academy which relates to the sovereign who, as the Comte de Neuilly, ended his days at Claremont. It is noble, courageous, and affecting—honourable to the king who inspired such devoted attachment, honourable to the faithful servant who, in such an hour, 'spoke so sweetly and so well.'

We remember, in the autumn of 1847, to have heard a man

of highly cultivated mind speak of Louis Philippe as one who 'seemed to have check-mated fate.' It was no uncommon nor unreasonable delusion, and thousands of Frenchmen appeared to have partaken of it. We know that that monarchy vanished like a morning dream; and it is one of the best features of these volumes that they do not pretend to fathom all the causes of its failure. How a monarch so politic, a minister so able, young princes so loved by both army and navy, all were unable to withstand a storm that looked at first like a cloud no bigger than a man's hand,—this is still a mystery, but M. de Carné draws from it a lesson that all of us may safely lay to heart. Do not the words we have italicised suggest the existence of a perilous temptation, to which we are all liable, in our own little spheres of action, no less than statesmen on their larger theatre?

'From the Congress of Vienna down to the Conference of London, we had become so thoroughly accustomed (*on avait pris une telle habitude*) to remain masters of events, that we believed ourselves in a position to control them at all times. *If we bowed before Providence, it was with the conviction that it had almost abdicated in favour of bankers and statesmen.* No epoch, probably, entertained more complete delusions on the omnipotence of skilfulness and talent; it was, if the expression may be allowed, offering a temptation to God to scatter them. . . . Such was the state of France, when there burst that thunderbolt, whose baleful lightnings suddenly disclosed so many new horizons, and unknown abysses. Never did God retake, in a more signally awful manner, (*avec un éclat plus terrible,*) possession of the government of human affairs, which He seems at times to delegate to us; never did Providence more completely baffle all the calculations of our prudence, all the speculations of our poor humiliated reason.'

The Count de Montalembert has since expressed the same thoughts concerning the same event, in the first chapter of his 'Avenir Politique.' 'Nous avons tous, depuis 1848, l'expérience personnelle de la vanité de nos prévisions, et de la fragilité de nos arguments. Jamais peut-être Dieu ne s'est plu davantage à démentir les calculs de la sagesse humaine, et à se jouer de nos espérances.'

We do not care to follow M. de Carné through his few remaining pages of his 'Etudes,' nor can we find room for more than incidental allusions to the letters which follow. But the very recollection of that Provisional Government, by the side of which the Orleans rule looks like the perfection of wisdom and patriotism; of those leaders whom our author, after a few heavy blows, leaves with a mercy with which contempt is largely mingled; of the reckless press, so ambitiously comprehensive in its would-be-large ideas and pretensions, yet so malignantly personal and unfair; of the dread, by no means an unfounded dread, of red-republicanism and socialism;—the recollection of these things, we say, is enough to remove all surprise that such

a nation should take refuge in Imperialism, however wonderful it may be, and we believe unexampled in history, that the successful aspirant after a crown should be one who had twice failed, and failed in such a manner as to make his hopes a laughing-stock in the eyes of Europe.

Here, then, though we may again have occasion for a passing reference, we take our grateful leave of M. de Carné's volumes. If any youthful student of history should be induced to read them, it may be well that he should first refresh his memory upon the principal facts of the different epochs which are criticised, inasmuch as the author's position is that of a commentator upon history, rather than an historian; but with this proviso, he will find them fully worthy of his best attention; and if he compare their tone with that of the fatalistic school, he will hardly, we trust, consider that our admiration of them is overcharged.

We have still to offer a few broken and hasty remarks upon the twofold question of the possibility and the desirability of Imperialism becoming the rule of England. It is well known that Hume regarded absolute monarchy as the most probable *euthanasia* of the British constitution; and Coleridge (in accordance, we believe, with Vico) has expressed a similar opinion upon representative government in general. We know that in several countries it has actually so failed; and although many writers, from Blackstone to Professor Newman, throw all the blame upon the sovereigns, yet this will not, we are sure, be the conclusion adopted by any fair critic of the annals of such countries as Spain, or even Austria. We quite agree with the remarks of Mr. R. C. Trench, in the preface to his 'Translations from Calderon,' that the Spanish rule of Philip II. was not such a despotism as would have been that of Charles I. in England, if his plan of dispensing with parliaments had succeeded. The latter would have been anti-national, and only upheld by the strong hand of armed authority; but the people of Spain accepted absolutism, as best suited to their national temper at that time, and not only acquiesced, but even gloried in it.

Now, it is idle to shut our eyes to the fact, that the indirectness and complication of constitutional government is a constant theme with writers of the day. Complaints of this kind have met our eyes in three journals, of most varied character, within the course of a single week. They may be heard, too, in very different grades of society. A Prince Consort did not hesitate, under the pressure of our war difficulties, to swell the cry. And, as generally happens when such ideas are to be found floating in different directions, some distinguished writers have aided in originating, or at least in powerfully expressing them. Thus

Mr. Merivale, if we recollect aright, calls attention to the fictitious character of the existing sovereignty in Great Britain, and is ready to acknowledge the justice of the celebrated *dictum* of Tacitus upon mixed government,¹ on the ground that England had long been a democracy, modified only by the indirect influence of the crown and the aristocracy. And the later volumes of his history of the Roman Empire seem to gravitate towards Imperialism. And, lest we should be in danger of unconsciously modifying the expression of doubts uttered by such thinkers as Mr. Grote and Mr. Hallam, it may be well to give an extract from each, *verbatim*. Thus, in a chapter adorned with that extraordinary richness of illustration which marks his work, does the latest historian of Greece depict the insuperable difficulty which Aristotle would have experienced in imagining a constitutional monarchy.

‘The theory of a constitutional king, especially as it exists in England, would have appeared to him impracticable: to establish a king who will reign without governing—in whose name all government is carried on, yet whose personal will is, in practice, of little or no effect—exempt from all responsibility, without making use of the exemption—receiving from every one unmeasured demonstrations of homage, which are never translated into act, except within the bounds of a known law—surrounded with all the paraphernalia of power, yet acting as a passive instrument in the hands of ministers, marked out for his choice by indications which he is not at liberty to resist. This remarkable combination of the fiction of superhuman grandeur and licence, with the reality of an invisible strait-waistcoat, is what an Englishman has in his mind when he speaks of a constitutional king; the events of our history have brought it to pass in England, amidst an aristocracy the most powerful that the world has yet seen, but we have still to learn whether it can be made to exist elsewhere, or whether the occurrence of a single king, at once able, aggressive, and resolute, may not suffice to break it up.’

Mr. Hallam, in one of the supplemental notes appended to the most recent additions of his ‘Middle Ages,’ writes as follows:—

‘A king is a person; to persons alone we attach the attributes of power and wisdom; on persons we bestow our affection or ill-will. An abstraction, a politic idea of royalty, is convenient for lawyers; it suits the speculative reasoner, but it never can become so familiar to a people, especially one too rude to have listened to such reasoners, as the simple image of the king, the one man whom we are to love and to fear. The other idea is a sort of monarchical pantheism, of which the vanishing point is a republic. And to this the prevalent theory, that kings are to reign but not to govern, cannot but lead. It is a plausible, and in the main, perhaps, for the times we have reached, a necessary theory, but it renders monarchy ultimately scarcely possible.’

There are those who regard such a possible consummation

¹ ‘Nam cunctas nationes et urbes populus aut primores aut singuli regunt: delecta ex iis et consociata reipublice forma laudari facilius quam evenire, vel si evenit, haud diuturna esse potest.’—Annal. iv. 33.

with fear, and there are those who regard it with hope. Among the latter, strange as it may at first sight appear, are to be found republicans, who are willing, for a season at least, to welcome absolutism. The Laureate used to be considered a minstrel of somewhat democratic tendency, but his latest hero is ready to submit with cheerfulness to any single executor of vigorous and honest government.

'Ah! for a man with heart, head, hand,
Like some of the simple great ones gone
For ever and ever by,
One still strong man in a blatant land—
Whatever they call him, what care I?—
Aristocrat, democrat, autocrat; one
Who can rule, and dare not lie.'—*Maud*.

The truth is, that besides the other points of similarity between democracy and imperialism, to which we have already alluded, a sole master may in many ways gratify republican tastes. He may be chosen by universal suffrage; he may be induced, as often happened in the mediæval republics of Italy, to be the champion of the populace against the nobles; above all, if not surrounded by an ancient *noblesse*, and time-honoured institutions, he may be deposed without great difficulty, or his sway may perish with him, and the rule of democracy succeed.

It is some such form of Imperialism as this that Mr. Congreve comes forward to recommend for Britain. In a clever *resumé* of the history of the Western Empire, from Augustus to Augustulus, he enunciates the opinion that the government of the Cæsars was an improvement upon the republic; he reminds us of all its exploits in war and in legislation, and hence takes occasion to enforce upon us the duty of preparing our minds for the reception of a similar rule at home. The absolutism thus destined for us is not indeed to be hereditary; the monarch is to enjoy an absolute power of naming his successor (as, we believe, Hobbes recommends), without even the limitation of choosing from the royal family. Neither does our *doctrinaire* politician say, with Virgil's Jupiter, *Imperium sine fine dedi*; his theoretic autocracy is only intended to last for a time; it will prepare men for 'the new organization of society on the basis of industry;' and the ideal autocrat is to make way for this ultimate result without struggle or difficulty, inasmuch as he is supposed to recognise, amidst the exercise of his functions, 'their inherently provisional character.'

Mr. Congreve's recommendation of Imperialism is based, not merely upon its positive merits, exhibited (as he maintains) in the Roman empire, but likewise on its superiority to representative monarchy.

'Such states as the larger kingdoms of modern Europe, with no exception as to our own country, are not fit subjects for the constitutional system. That system, with its fictions and its indirect action, may offer advantages at certain times—as, historically, it has done with us—but, on the whole, I think it alien to good government. It has ever failed—and I appeal to the history of England in support of my assertion, and not merely to the present disgraceful state of our government, though that is so much in accordance with past history as to exonerate, in a measure, the men at the expense of the system. It is failing you now [February, 1855] in the presence of real dangers and war. It is of more than doubtful advantage in peace. For myself, I heartily wish that the time were come when we were clear of the government of boards, call them a cabinet or a vestry, with all their complications of personal and local interests, and under the government of one—a protector or dictator, if you like to call him so—the name is unimportant; the essential is, that he should be one who would rule England as she was ruled by Cromwell.'

This is at least plain speaking. But before such doctrine is allowed to pass unquestioned, two or three positions have to be established. In the first place, is it very probable that rulers can be found who will be content to pass over their own children, and bequeath their power to a stranger? Can any reasonable number of instances of such behaviour—say, for moderation's sake, some five or six—be pointed out, in the history of any state whatever, since the world began? We mean, of course, with the parent's real consent, for it will not do to refer to uncles who have displaced nephews, or successors forced upon an emperor by the voice of the Prætorian guards. Certainly, Aristotle, who is generally allowed to be no bad judge of human nature, seems to have regarded such a course of succession as all but impossible. He pronounces it, in a treatise which Mr. Congreve himself has edited, to be difficult, as demanding a degree of virtue above human nature.¹ Such conduct might be the mark of a character above the ordinary standard of human nature, but it might also be the sign of one below it. If there be one touch of deep tenderness in the character of Napoleon the First, it is his affection for his youthful son. We must wait to see the ideal dictator, before we can judge of his merit or demerit in this respect. Mr. Congreve's hero, Cromwell, had assuredly no idea of letting the chief authority depart from his own house. And when we call to mind that it was *one* of the Divine rewards (though not *the* reward) to the Father of the Faithful, that he should be the head and origin of a great nation; that Saul was punished by the withdrawal of the royalty from his family; that David thanked the Almighty for this, amongst other blessings, that He had 'spoken of his servant's house for a great while to come;' and that even Jehu, for a partial obedience,

¹ Χαλεπὸν . . . καὶ μείζονος ἀρετῆς ἢ κατ' ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν.—*Polit.* iii. 15 (ed. Bekker).

was promised the throne to the fourth generation; we are unable to see that the device of appointing a stranger, as the heir, derives any more sanction from Revelation than it does from history or philosophy.

Secondly, in what sense is it true that constitutional government has failed in England? It is, of course, easy to erect a transcendental standard of perfection, and to show that we fall, as a nation, very far short of that standard. But will Mr. Congreve, or any of his fellow-admirers of absolutism, have the goodness to point out which of the actual countries of Europe should be taken as our model? Switzerland, we fear, has hardly yet arrived 'at the organization of society on the basis of industry.' Is Austria, with her difficulties in Hungary and Italy, to be our model?—Austria, which Shakspeare apostrophised of old:—

'Thou ever strong upon the stronger side!
Thou Fortune's champion! that dost never fight
But when her humorous ladyship is by
To teach thee safety!'¹

Is it France, with its eight governments in seventy years? Or must we cross the Atlantic (for it is idle to speak of Asia or Africa), and compare the mother country with a daughter so very differently circumstanced? Until we have some concrete shape to deal with, the problem is far too ærial for discussion.

Thirdly, has our lecturer presented to us a fair portraiture of the Empire of Rome? Upon this, to a great extent, depends the justice of his conclusions. Now, of intentional unfairness we believe Mr. Congreve quite incapable. But it is possible that undue prepossessions have marred the clearness of his mental vision. The omission of literature was necessary, on account of the limits imposed by lectures, but was it not also necessary for his case? Mr. Congreve has brought into strong relief all the benefits of the Empire, but where has he alluded, in anything like just terms, to its ten wicked persecutions of Christianity? His apology for the intolerant emperors seems to us to withdraw from them the one palliation that ever can be offered for persecution; we mean the deep and stern conviction (such as marked that Pharisee who became S. Paul), on the part of the persecutors, that they are really engaged in extirpating an injurious falsehood, which dishonours God and injures the souls of men. Such persecutors, we know, *may* obtain mercy, because they did it ignorantly in unbelief.

But we are happily spared the necessity of examining into the chief features of Mr. Congreve's historical sketch. If it be

¹ King John, Act III. Sc. 1.

objected to Oxford, that a late Fellow and Tutor of one of her Colleges has been uttering paradoxes, and endangering men's loyalty, *Alma Mater* may reply that she has supplied the antidote as well as the bane. The volume of 'Oxford Essays,' for 1856, closes with a paper by a Fellow of another College, which professes to be a review of Mr. Congreve's Lectures. It might more correctly, perhaps, be described as a reply. We all know the story of the clergyman (and reviewers must often sympathise with him), who said that if he had more time he could make his sermons shorter. Mr. Goldwin Smith has had time, and he has thoroughly succeeded in achieving brevity. In less than seventeen pages he has compressed an amount of matter, which most of us, we fear (had we possessed it), would have diluted into thrice that quantity. For powerful reasoning, grave humour, and vigour of style, we have not, for some time past, seen anything to equal this essay.

Nevertheless, not being inclined in political science *jurare in verba magistri*, we cannot allow even the animated reasonings of Mr. Goldwin Smith to carry us entirely away. While ranging ourselves, on the entire case, most decidedly on his side, as against that espoused by Mr. Congreve, we claim the liberty, in one or two respects, of a slight modification of his case. Thus, for instance, we think it possible that his strong feeling against despots has led him to underrate the intellect (we do not say the character) of Julius Cæsar. And again, the merit really due to Imperialism, in enacting codes of law, might have been admitted more ungrudgingly. Whatever were the services of the Stoic philosophers, as a plain matter of fact, they *did* not, and it is more than probable that they *could* not, consolidate the Roman law. And we beg leave to question the correctness of the assertion, 'that the Convention left the *Code Napoleon* in their bureau.' The social changes adopted by the Constituent Assembly were doubtless ratified in that code; but what authority can the essayist produce for attributing any part of it to the Convention? If, however, as he seems to think, there exists a 'moral incongruity of a disagreeable kind, in the idea' of receiving a benefit from tyrants, we can hardly suppose that Mr. Goldwin Smith could feel any peculiar pleasure in receiving a code from the hands of Danton or Maximilian Robespierre. And, last of blemishes (as they appear to us) in this remarkable paper, we may mention an apparent non-recognition of the really deep influence which the Empire, with all its sins, did exercise upon the kingdoms of modern Christendom. Writers so far removed from any love of absolutism as Guizot and Palgrave, with many more, are strenuous in asserting that influence as being, on the whole, an element of good.

But, with these slight drawbacks, we cordially approve the general tenor of Mr. Goldwin Smith's masterly performance, and feel grateful to him, as for an intellectual treat, so no less for the high and healthy tone of his production. We cannot find space even for specimens of his successive rejoinders to Mr. Congreve, point by point; but we would name, as peculiarly happy, the proof that the succession to the Roman empire was, after all, practically hereditary.

The feeling against representative government has arisen perhaps, in part, among literary men, from its tendency to foster haste and shallowness of thought. This danger is well exposed in Mr. Macaulay's review of Gladstone upon 'Church and State.' With the main feature of that article, its denial of a state-conscience, we are not much more disposed to agree than was Dr. Arnold. But the particular peril referred to is pointed out with exceeding clearness.

Another cause of the distrust may arise from the discovery that self-interest and hypocrisy *do* play a part in other governments, as well as despotic ones. The great difficulty of dealing with the political offence of bribery, arises from our knowledge of the way in which appeals to interest may be made, without incurring its penalties. Thus, if Mr. A., the candidate for a seat, promises a sovereign to a poor man for his vote, it is bribery; but if he pledge himself to Mr. B., the eminent soap-boiler, as an ardent opponent of the iniquitous tax upon one of the articles most essential to the production of soap, this is not bribery. But the hope that this particular tax should be removed appeals to Mr. B.'s love of gain, quite as strongly as the actual bribe to the labourer. A somewhat similar effect is produced upon the minds of Presidents of Republics, and Members of the British Parliament, by the near approach of the time for re-elections. Both are in danger of speaking and acting with a sole view to popularity. It is notorious that the discussion of particular questions in the House of Commons will probably issue in a different result according to the age of that parliament. A motion may be carried in its first year of sitting which would almost inevitably be lost in the sixth. Such an eye to the opinion of constituencies of necessity involves a lamentable lack of moral courage, a virtue which Mr. Disraeli has termed 'the *rarest* and most admirable of public life.' Hence the origin of the accusation, on the part of admirers of Imperialism, that democracies and constitutional monarchies cover as much hypocrisy as the court of an autocrat.

Another cause of the reaction against representative institutions is unquestionably to be found in the somewhat extravagant admiration of them which has been displayed by their supporters. It was

gravely maintained that the application of British institutions to any given country, without reference to climate, race, or previous history, was a remedy for every evil. And when it was discovered that constitutionalism did not at once work well in Spain, that it was overthrown in France, and that the Chinese inhabitants of the Isle of Chusan were very glad, after three years' experience of English rule, to return to the customs and government of their own empire, the shock caused by such astounding discoveries appears to have made many thinkers lose all confidence in the form of government of which they had once entertained such sanguine hopes.

We have thus far attempted to weigh in the balance some of the most prominent advantages and disadvantages of Imperialism, more especially as contrasted with institutions such as those of England. It is highly probable that the mere attempt to be fair has rendered us tiresome and indistinct; and engendered something of that very involution of style with which we have found fault in the pages of M. de Carné. But although we have striven to be just towards the advocates of Imperialism—to allow their strong points, no less than the weak points of the systems they oppose—we are most anxious that our conclusions with respect to England should not be for a moment misunderstood. Whatever be the requirements of other countries, *we have not the slightest faith in the doctrine, that absolutism in any shape is desirable for Great Britain.* And as we believe such a consummation to be undesirable, so too do we believe it to be improbable. That it would be preferable to anarchy and to red-republicanism we fully grant, but that must be the extent of our admissions. And while we acknowledge it to be of the essence of a free country, that the defects of its institutions and the merits of other systems should undergo the ordeal of just and searching criticism, we submit that it is possible to assume the censor's office in a very unchastened spirit, to play with words, to trifle with consequences, and, above all, to be ungrateful to God for the unspeakable blessings which He has vouchsafed to us under that form of government which it is our pride and our happiness to possess. It is very possible that such faults may have been committed unconsciously, very possible that we ourselves may not have been wholly free from them.

'Scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim.'

But is not there too much truth in the remark of M. de Montalembert, 'that a great portion of the enthusiasm displayed in England on behalf of absolutism, arises from a conviction on the part of its admirers' [whether well or ill founded is not to

the point] 'that there is no danger of their ever having practical experience of its working?'

It is almost enough to raise a blush upon our cheeks, to think that a foreigner should have depicted so forcibly the benefits which we ourselves are often slow to realize. The Count de Montalembert is, in many points, by no means prejudiced in favour of England. If we were at present concerned with the theological aspect of the case, there might be two or three topics of debate and difference to consider in his 'De l'Avenir Politique de l'Angleterre.' We think that his opinion of the English Church, though evidently much raised since the publication of his treatise 'Des Interêts Catholiques' in 1852, would be still improved by further acquaintance with the Prayer-Book. We might be disposed to question the justice of parts of his portraiture of the English clergy; and we should most certainly combat his position, that the decadence and present powerlessness of Spain may be traced to political despotism alone, without any portion of the blame being justly assigned to the influence of Roman Catholicism.

But at present we are more especially concerned with the political portion; and in common, we are sure, with hundreds of our countrymen and countrywomen, we beg to tender to M. de Montalembert the expression of our hearty thanks for a work at once so brilliant and interesting, displaying so much *finesse* of observation; and so gratifying, upon the whole, in its reference to the past and present of our national life—so cheering as regards its future. What with the large circulation of the work in its original language, the translations, and the quarrels concerning their fidelity, the extracts given in magazines, and the criticisms, reasonable and unreasonable, we may venture to assume upon the part of our readers a tolerable acquaintance with its contents. Will they pardon us if, coming into the field at so late a period, when the harvest has been well-nigh reaped, we try to gain a few gleanings here and there, which are not wholly alien from our theme.

It is possible that the intensity of M. de Montalembert's regret for the loss of a free press and representative institutions in his own country, may have tempted him to paint England almost too much *couleur de rose* . Critics have already pointed out how little notice is taken of our manufacturing towns, or of the tone of our colonies—as, for instance, Australia; on the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the Count speaks strongly (as he always has spoken) against the foreign policy of England. And it would ill become us, after having said so much in this article of the national sins of France, to be hasty in rejecting the accusations thus made. We fear that there is too much truth in

them. Our governing classes have often proved extremely indifferent to our dealings with foreign nations, excepting where a party advantage could be gained by one side or the other. Take the case of our war with China, in 1840. We will venture to say, that no seriously-minded man can study that question without finding himself compelled to agree with the French traveller, M. Huc, with the American senator, Mr. Cass, with Lord John Manners and with Dr. Arnold at home, in denouncing that war as most flagrantly wicked and unjust. Yet, when a most distinguished Member of the House of Commons protested, at the time, against the part taken by Great Britain, he found that he was addressing almost empty benches.

We would willingly devote a page to an examination of that contempt of logic, on the part of English politicians, which is more than once alluded to in this volume. But a reference to the chapter upon the *Logic of Politics*, in the 'Treatise on Logic,' by Mr. J. S. Mill, compared with the remarks of Mr. Macaulay on the Toleration Act, in the third volume of his History, or with Lord John Russell's little work upon the English Constitution, will be found to suggest all that we could have pretended to offer, and must now omit for want of space.

But we cannot so lightly pass by the question of aristocracy, to which so large a portion of this book is dedicated; for it stands in the closest and most vital connexion with tendencies to democracy or to absolutism. The English writers who recommend either of these extremes, invariably direct their attacks against the nobility. They hold, and not without reason, that the Crown might easily be either abolished or made autocratic, if once the influence of the peerage were overthrown.

Waiving the insensate dream of those who would attempt to introduce perfect equality into the world, we may remark perhaps five or six main causes of the superiority of one person to another. These are strength, beauty, rank, wealth, talents, and antiquity of race. The first of these, strength, is, of course, only available in actual war, or in savage states of society. The second, beauty, is influential on a wider scale; very often for evil, as in the case of corrupt courts, or anarchical conditions of society; yet often likewise for good, more often, perhaps, than might at first sight be recognised. We know that once, at least, the beauty of a Jewish maiden was divinely overruled to the preservation of the chosen race. 'Mordecai commanded to answer Esther . . . Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?' Rank may be, as in Turkey or China, or in the case of those who have in Europe procured their own elevation, dissociated from nobility of birth; but as this is only exceptional in England, we may fairly include both under one and the same

category.¹ The strong man affects the minds of his comrades, who choose him for their leader, and of the enemies whom he slays or routs; the beauty moves those alone who behold her, or who become acquainted with her charms through the skill of the artist or the lay of the bard.

But nobility and wealth take a wider range, and exercise influence upon numbers who have scarcely seen the possessors; and as these two gifts may often be dissevered, a rivalry is no unfrequent result. We hear, in our own day, complaints that money is gaining ascendancy over nobility of blood. But such complaints re-appear from time to time, and are by no means peculiar to the nineteenth century. To name a single proof. The works of the Greek poet, Theognis, in the sixth century B.C., are replete with complaints of the overthrow of the aristocracy of birth by the new aristocracy of wealth.

Genius, too, has often its own competition with birth. To leaven the thoughts of others long after death is a nobility, nay, a royalty of itself. But, forasmuch as God is not wont to impart too many of these coveted gifts to any one person, so do we see that the great stars of literature are not ordinarily permitted to become founders of families. Seldom do their descendants live for more than one or two generations. Shakspeare and Milton have no heirs. Edmund Burke and Walter Scott cherished it as the one wish of their hearts that they might found families; but it was not permitted. The melancholy foreboding with which Mr. Hallam concludes his 'Literature of Europe' has proved but too true; and a very slight research will enable the reader to make a long catalogue of similar examples.

Wealth may be acquired as well as inherited; and acquired by the most discreditable means. Genius may owe much to cultivation. In both, therefore, though only existent, *favente Deo*, the human element is often more or less conspicuous. But it is otherwise with birth. 'Birth is a possession which cannot be acquired by those to whom it has not been granted by the Father of mankind. It is a pre-eminence which may be rendered more useful or more illustrious by wealth, or intellect, or station, but which neither wealth nor station can impart. It is a power not conceded either by king or by people, and which neither the arbitrary will of the despot, nor the more arbitrary tyranny of the multitude, can obliterate. Man cannot bestow dignity of birth, man cannot take it away. Whatever results from time is incommunicable, and cannot be supplied by any

¹ We are not, however, forgetful of ancient families, who, like the Malets or Molcoworths, have constantly refused the peerage; nor of the many cases in which an ennobled branch is not the eldest of its name. These must be considered to be included by us under the general term of aristocracy.

'other element. Hence nobility of birth is an authority before which man's natural freedom humbles itself most unwillingly, and which "the age of great cities and civilization" seeks most anxiously to destroy.'

M. de Montalembert, like other writers of our day, has his misgivings about the security of our *noblesse*. Eulogizing their courage and public spirit, he yet calls to mind that the French monarchy fell under the best and most pious of sovereigns, Louis XVI. If we speak upon this topic, our words will probably be received with the caution justly due to the remarks of an anonymous author upon such themes. Nothing is more possible than that the pen of the critic may, in such a case, be guided by the impulse at one time of gratified vanity, at another time of mortified vanity.

We think that we could show that the analogy suggested by our author does not hold good. Enough to say, that if the French crown was trampled under foot, though worn by a Louis XVI., that overthrow had been prepared by the work of his two immediate predecessors; that the English nobility have never been a gentilitial caste, like the French of old; that they have never learnt to despise country life, and make their dignity dependent upon the Court alone. Nevertheless, we say it with diffidence, they do incur great danger by yielding to some temptations of their position.

That all government is intended for the good of the governed, is the doctrine of religion and philosophy. 'He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.' It is the teaching of Socrates, when, in the very opening of Plato's republic, he confutes the opposite theory of the sophist Thrasymachus. It is made by Aristotle the test of a true form of monarchy, aristocracy, or democracy, as distinguished from their several corruptions. It has been proclaimed, in words at least, by selfish monarchs like Philippe le Bel, or again by those hypocritical heroes of the Fronde so happily described by Madame de Motteville, as being '*infected* with the love of the public weal.' But it is the sore temptation of all who enjoy power, to forget that power was bestowed, not for mere selfish enjoyment, but for 'the glory of the Creator, and the relief of man's estate.' They come to look upon it as merely, or at least mainly, as a boon for the benefit of their own order.

It is impossible to observe the conduct of those gifted with high social station (be their political creed what it may), without becoming conscious how deeply such a feeling colours their general tone of thought. Hence arises, despite many illustrious

¹ Sir F. Palgrave; Merchant and Friar, c. 4.

exceptions, a tendency to caste feeling, and too frequently a needless irritation of numbers, who would otherwise cheerfully acquiesce in the present condition of English society. When an ambassador will not even take the trouble to present to the sovereign of a foreign court, men of science who had a right to expect such attention, because they were visiting in an official capacity; when a duke, not content with bowing out an intruder, must needs eject him in a manner which, if ducal, is certainly not really dignified nor Christian; when an earl,¹ as unfortunately distinguished by *hauteur* as by undoubted courage and honour, cannot even preserve courtesy to one only a degree lower than his own condition; the chief actors in such cases are, we believe, really unaware how deep an injury they are inflicting upon their own order, how needlessly they alienate the affection and respect which thousands would yield so willingly to their other claims. Might they not frequently be addressed in the language which Lord Worcester is made to hold to Hotspur?—

'You must needs learn, lord, to amend this fault;
Though sometimes it show greatness, courage, blood,
(And that's the dearest grace it renders you,)
Yet oftentimes it doth present harsh rage,
Defect of manners, want of government,
Pride, haughtiness, opinion, and disdain;
*The least of which, haunting a nobleman,
Loseth men's hearts; and leaves behind a stain
Upon the beauty of all parts besides,
Beguiling them of commendation.'*

At the same time, it would be well if those who, on such accounts, would rejoice to see the overthrow of the British aristocracy, would consider what they seek to substitute in its stead. Is it the *functionarism* of the Continent? Mr. Laing, with all his anti-aristocratic feelings, yet admits, in his 'Notes of a Traveller,' that such a change is a change for the worse. Is it Americanism? We are not going to say harsh things about America, but we know that many a partizan of democracy comes back to England, after a few months spent in the United States, with a tendency towards even oligarchy, from the intensity of the reaction which his sentiments have undergone. Is it the rule of the *bourgeoisie*, such as was in power under Louis Philippe?

The latter class has many great and noble virtues, but is it not

¹ 'I can hardly find terms to express my indignation at the unwarrantable language in which your letter is couched. If, as a peer of the realm, your lordship considers this as a sufficient reason to be abusive to those who simply fulfil their duty, and tell you what is right, I, as a son of a peer of the realm, will tell your lordship in return, that such conduct will not escape the censure of the people of this land; and that it is by such pride, and by such tyranny, that the voice of the country has already cried out against the aristocracy, and it is by such means that their downfall will be accelerated.'—The Vicar of Glapthorne to the Earl of C—n, (Guardian, of 12th December, 1855.)

as often purse-proud, as nobles can be birth-proud? Our clever satirists, such as Thackeray, Dickens, and Mrs. Ormsby Gore, portray vividly all that is mean and debasing in connexion with tuft-hunting, and their satire is but too frequently just and salutary. But it should be remembered that both counter-pride and mean servility have a tendency to foster the very faults complained of. The one fault is exhibited in the restless vanity of Burns, the other by some of the gentry whom Moore used to meet at Holland House.

Neither can our *savans*, often so great in the closet, be always acquitted of restless desire of admiration when abroad.

'The man of science himself is fonder of glory, and vain ;

An eye well-practised in nature, a spirit bounded and poor.'

We do not believe that England would be happy under their rule, or that of literary men. The literary class (even Mr. Macaulay admits) have some very unpleasant faults. In power they would soon prove intolerable.

Therefore, while not insensible to the faults of our nobility, nor desirous of recommending anything beyond that deference which is compatible with true self-respect, so wonderfully displayed in the example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, we still believe in a long career of honour and usefulness for our Peers, and, with their stability, in the freedom of England from democracy or imperialism. Even those who think themselves insulted or aggrieved, can often bear it more easily from those accustomed to power. Cassandra, in the grand tragedy of 'Æschylus,' congratulates herself in thinking, that, though enslaved, she is not going to be under the orders of *nouveaux riches*. The lover of *Maud* taunts his rival, not with his rank, but because he is 'this new-made lord.'

There is, after all, to quote again the language of Sir F. Palgrave, 'a value attached to noble birth by the natural and 'universal feeling of mankind ; *perhaps, most of all, by those who attempt to cry down that value.*' Assuredly the cry comes with an ill grace from those who, while denouncing what they call flunkeyism, are ready to pander to all the prejudices of republics, or the passions of mobs.

Perhaps it may be, that all orders are preserved by the salt of their worthy members, as the cities of the plain might have been rescued from their fiery doom by the presence of ten righteous men. And if it be lawful to think thus, there must still be hope, even amidst all discouragement, for England and her time-honoured institutions. For, take the different estates, Clergy, Lords, Commons, there is not one which cannot show specimens worthy of the country's brightest days. Even those instincts which seem more susceptible of gratification under other forms

of government, need not perish under constitutional monarchy. Attachment to persons can still rest upon a sovereign, and from time to time upon great men. Indeed, it is far grander and more healthful for the mind's eye to gaze upon a greatness, like that of a Wellington, content in dutiful loyalty to serve his sovereign, than to look at those who have made their successes a mere stepping-stone to the first place in the land.¹ To the charges of indirectness it is enough to reply, that, on the whole, the system *works well*. To Churchmen who, like ourselves, lament the degree of subjection to which their spiritual Mother is reduced, we would hint that their hope must *not* be based on a mere change of our earthly frame of polity. They must be content to learn, *sub Deo*,

‘That in ourselves our safety must be sought;
That by our own right hands it must be wrought;
That we must stand unpropp’d, or be laid low.’

For proof that popular government *need* not necessitate superficiality of thought, we may point to our recent works in theology, metaphysics, and classical history. The existing lack of moral courage is attributed by an acute observer, Mr. J. S. Mill, rather to the general effect of modern civilization, than to any particular form of government. Hypocrisy is at least more liable to reproof, more momentary (as M. de Tocqueville has suggested) under a free, than a despotic sway. It is rebuked by those brave men who dare (and we have always some such) to resist the current of popular opinion, and who invariably receive the respect of a large body of their countrymen, even of those who, on the particular point of controversy, do not agree with them. It is rebuked at times by that noble gift of eloquence, which can hardly ever enjoy long life under autocracy, which can never die, though at times it may languish, where there is liberty.

Perhaps it may be requisite for the most favourable display of constitutional monarchy, that it be tried among races which, like the Dorian, the Roman, and the Anglo-Saxon, and unlike the impulsive Celt, have a natural love of law and order implanted in their hearts. We do not seek to force it upon others, we only claim to cherish it for ourselves. These institutions have nursed

¹ Napoleon, as is well known, expected that his great opponent, the victor at Waterloo, would make an attempt to gain a crown. As M. de Montalembert most justly remarks:—‘His own career, so adventurous, so rapid, the many fortunes he had made and unmade, his habit of playing with the consciences of others as with his own,—all this prevented his being able to comprehend that an Englishman, even when arrived at the highest summit of glory and popularity, had no better object before him than to remain in his place, to do his duty, to enjoy his position in the Parliament of his country, to raise there a respected voice, and then to find in the creation of an agricultural patrimony, such as that founded by the Duke of Wellington at Strathfieldsaye, the occupation of his declining years, and the security of his posterity.’

our great and good ones for long ages. Britannia may say with the Athenian of old,

ταὺτ' ἐστὶν ἐκείνα,
ἐξ ὧν ἄνδρας Μαραθωνομάχας ἡμὴ παιδεύσεις ἔθρεψεν.

They have proved elastic in many a crisis; they may prove elastic still. They are surely compatible with greater scope of personal action on the part of the sovereign, if talent and temperament so impel a future ruler, than has been exercised during the two or three latest reigns. Still, then, may we hope to be preserved from the political pantheism described by Mr. Hallam, and trust that Mr. Grote's semi-prediction may be but partially fulfilled, in another generation, by the appearance of a king who shall be 'able' and 'resolute' without being 'aggressive.' May that magnificent *Coronation Service* which, in its main substance, has been used in England for more than nine hundred years past, and which even Pepin and the Franks seemed to have borrowed from Britain, be repeated, if it please God, again and again; and may its prayers to the Throne of Grace on high preserve that earthly throne from lapsing into the despotism of one, or being overthrown by the despotism of the many! And if England's Laureate has for a moment swelled the cry for the stern authority of a single master, we appeal, we will not say from Philip drunk to Philip sober, but at least from our poet singing under the excitement wrought by the pressure of war, to the calmer lays which he poured forth in the days of peace, now happily again restored to us. We call to remembrance how he bade us love our land, with a love that was brought afar from out the storied Past, used in the Present, and transfused by thought into the Future. We bethink us how he vaunted his mother-country as the home of that free speech, which an individual sway is almost certain to restrain.

'It is the land that freemen till,
That sober-suited Freedom chose;
The land where, girt with friends or foes,
A man may speak the thing he will.'

We remember how he prayed, and it is a prayer which we have not unlearned, for the duration of a liberty that yearned for all things true, and therefore repelled violence from whatever quarter it might arise; a liberty imaged forth in a grave matron, who gazed down from this her island altar.

'Her open eyes desire the truth;
The wisdom of a thousand years
Is in them. May perpetual youth
Keep dry their light from tears;
'That her fair form may stand and shine,
Make bright our days, and light our dreams,
Turning to scorn, with lips divine,
The falsehood of extremes!'

ART. II.—*Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.* Edited by ROBERT BELL. 8 vols. 8vo. London: John W. Parker & Son, West Strand. 1856.

It has been often remarked that England has preserved more of the mediæval traditions than any other country in Europe. Our government is a modification of the constitutional monarchy of the Anglo-Saxons and Normans; the principles and maxims of our laws are the same which endeared those of Edward the Confessor to the people. Even the very act, which seemed to sever the connexion between our religion and that of the middle ages, tended, by stopping the centralizing system which was developing itself more and more strongly in the policy of the court of Rome, to preserve the shell of ecclesiastical traditions and associations, which, in other European nations, have been swept away by the pseudo-classical tastes of the *renaissance*. The material fabrics, at least, of our cathedrals and parish-churches remain in better preservation than in most countries which have preserved their connexion with Rome; and our universities, with their chapels and common dining-halls and quiet cloisters, present an appearance so mediæval as to strike M. de Montalembert with admiration, and Mr. Heywood with dismay. We seem to be animated by the old Roman spirit of pride and veneration for our country, not only in her present but in her past existence; and so valuable is this national feeling, and so conducive to sobriety and respect for the laws, that, even when it is falsely and absurdly applied, we cannot help regarding it with some degree of favour. If we only go far enough back in our appeal to our old institutions, we find ourselves in the midst of times when the necessities of mutual defence obliged men to cooperate for the common good; when an armed yeomanry and an independent clergy were able to command a recognition of their rights from those classes whose wealth and power tempt them to oppression. It is a significant fact that the country which has pre-eminently preserved her respect for her early traditions, is the very one which now enjoys the largest share of political freedom. We hail with pleasure, therefore, every symptom which we observe in the public mind of a desire to apply for a knowledge of our past history, manners, and customs, to authentic contemporary documents, rather than to the superficial and prejudiced compilations of our Scotch historians and philosophers, who, in their overweening veneration for their own fancied superiority, feel such a profound contempt for the ages which they attempt to depict, that they will not vouchsafe even to understand

them. Mr. Froude has pointed out our statute-law as the most authentic evidence of the politics of our ancestors; but the source from whence we can best derive a knowledge of their domestic manners, modes of thinking, and social condition, is obviously their popular literature.

It is for this reason that we feel a more than ordinary interest in the attempt, which Mr. Bell has been making, to render accessible to the generality of readers the works of a poet, who has described the social life of the fourteenth century in all its phases, with an elaborate accuracy and power which are unrivalled in any language. Chaucer stands in the same relation to the other poets of his own age, as the pre-Raphaelite school holds with respect to that of Claude or West. His matured genius led him to dismiss the conventionalities of his predecessors and contemporaries, and to seek his inspiration in the realities of common life; and the wisdom of his choice is abundantly proved by the fact that now, after the lapse of five hundred years, his poems are read by his countrymen with delight and admiration. The politics, the religion, the philosophy of his time, are represented in his writings in their most intelligible form. He introduces us to the hall of the feudal baron, and its amusements and conversation, the counting-house of the wealthy merchant, the lodgings of the undergraduate, the cloister of the monk, the 'limitation' of the begging friar, the parish of the country parson, and the cottage of the churl; his various personages are brought upon the scene in the full costume of their characters, and every particular of their dress and bearing, the topics of their conversation, and their modes of treating them, are so characteristic, that even at the present day we can recognise his portraits in the analogous classes of modern society. Here we find the military man of high rank and courteous manners; the purse-proud merchant; the lawyer in his highest and lowest developments, from the bench to the sheriff's officer and 'touter' in the ecclesiastical courts; the several specimens of clergymen,—the pompous and formal dignitary, the popular preacher, the retired scholar, the jocular parson, and the laborious parish-priest; the plain-spoken and clever woman of business who 'attends races,' and the sentimental religious lady; the rollicking sailor, the keen and roguish steward, and the jolly landlord of the inn. All these characters, and many more, are brought before us in Chaucer's poems, with a vividness and reality which make us regard them as old acquaintances, rather than as the fanciful creations of one who has been in his grave for four centuries and a half.

To every one who has made English literature his study, the 'Canterbury Tales,' at least, are familiar; but there is a large

class of readers whom the supposed obsolescence of the language in which Chaucer wrote deters from giving his poetry that attention which it merits, both from its intrinsic excellence and as a study of mediæval manners. We therefore make no apology for taking advantage of Mr. Bell's new edition of his works to enter into details respecting them and their author, which to scholars may seem trite and unnecessary.

Strange as it may appear, this is the first collected edition of the whole of Chaucer's poetical works published since Urry's wretched failure. Tyrwhitt confined himself to the *Canterbury Tales*, as did also Mr. Thomas Wright. The Aldine edition, published by Pickering, and edited by Sir Harris Nicolas, is, as far as the *Canterbury Tales* go, a mere reprint of Tyrwhitt, and, for the other poems, it reproduces, word for word, and error for error, the unintelligible and corrupt text of Speght; while, as if to render the whole perfectly useless, Tyrwhitt's excellent glossary and notes are entirely omitted. The *Memoir*, by Sir Harris Nicolas, which is prefixed to it, is the only thing about it of any value. In the annotated edition Mr. Bell has taken Mr. Wright's accurate text of the *Canterbury Tales*, published by the Camden Society, as the basis of his own, recurring in some cases, however, to the MSS. where they gave, in his opinion, a better reading. For the other poems he has had recourse to the MSS. in the British Museum, the Bodleian, the Public Library at Cambridge, and the Hunterian Museum at Glasgow. His object appears to have been to obtain the text, as nearly as possible, as it was written by Chaucer himself, with all its peculiarities of grammar and orthography, trusting to explanatory introductions to each poem, to exegetical foot-notes, and a copious glossary, to render the text easily intelligible to the general reader. This plan, as he shows in his general introduction, is, indeed, the only satisfactory one. The retention of the old spelling is essential to the integrity of the metrical and grammatical structure, and presents no serious difficulty to any one who is likely to read or relish Chaucer. To the whole is prefixed an accurate and readable memoir of the poet, and an introduction, in which these and other questions of interest are fully discussed. We can safely say that in this edition we have enjoyed the 'father of English poetry' as we never enjoyed him before, and that with it in our library we should never dream of using the black-letter folio of Speght, the corrupt text of Urry and Tyrwhitt, or the booksellers' worthless reprints, which have hitherto been our only resources. Taking our facts, then, from Mr. Bell's *Memoir*, we shall endeavour to trace the poet's life, with especial reference to the progress of his genius, from its first timid imitations and

translations of the French allegorical school, till its maturity in the masterly delineation of character in the *Canterbury Tales*.

The origin of Chaucer's family is involved in obscurity, but we are inclined to give credit to the general tradition, current in the time of Speght, that it was engaged in commerce. There seems little reason to doubt that he was born in London. Without pretending to trace all the particulars of his life in *The Testament of Love*, or to distinguish what is purely fictitious from what is intended to relate to real events, we cannot help thinking that, in the following sentence, he means to express his love for the place of his nativity:—'Also the city of London, that is to me so dear and sweet, in which I was first grown; and more kindly love have I to that place than to any other on earth, as every creature hath full appetite to the place of his kindly engendrure.' From a passage in *The Court of Love*, believed to be the earliest poem of his now extant, and written in his eighteenth year, he appears to have been educated at Cambridge. Oxford has, indeed, disputed the honour of being his *alma mater*, and it is possible that he may have studied at both universities. Certain it is that he gives sketches of student-life in the fourteenth century at both Oxford and Cambridge, and the pictures he draws are extremely curious and full of vigour. It appears, as Mr. Bell in his note observes, 'that the late measure permitting students at the University to live in private lodgings, is in accordance with the ancient practice.' In the following extracts we shall take the liberty of adopting the modern mode of spelling, as far as it is consistent with the metre. This would indeed have been improper in an edition which, like Mr. Bell's, aims at being a standard authority; but we have no such reasons for rejecting a course which may assist such of our readers as are unacquainted with mediæval English, and encourage them to consult the original.

'Whilome there was dwelling at Oxenford,
A richè gnof¹ that guestès held to board,
And of his craft he was a carpenter.
With him there was dwelling a poor scholâr,
Had learned art;² but all his phantasy
Was turned for to learn astrology,
And could³ a certain of conclusions,
To deemè⁴ by interrogations,
If that men asked him in certain hours,
When that men should have drought, or elles showers;
Or if men asked him what should befall
Of everything, I may not reckon all.
This clerk was clepèd⁵ hendè⁶ Nicholas;
Of dernè⁷ love he could, and of solace;

¹ An oaf.

² Who had learned art; that is, the quadrivium.

³ Knew.

⁴ To judge. ⁵ Called.

⁶ Courteous.

⁷ Secret.

And therewith he was sly and full privy,
 And like a maiden meekè for to see.
 A chamber had he in that hostelry
 Alone, withouten any company,
 Full fetously idight¹ with herbès swoot,²
 And he himself as sweet as is the root
 Of licorice, or any cetewall.³
 His almagest,⁴ and bookès great and small,
 His astrylabè,⁵ longing for⁶ his art,
 His augrym stonès,⁷ lyen fair apart
 On shelves couchèd⁸ at his beddès head,
 His press i-covered with a falding⁹ red,
 And above all there lay a gay psaltery,
 On which he made o'nightes melody
 So sweetley that all the chamber rang,
 And *Angelus ad Virginem* he sang,
 And after that he sang the King's note;
 Full often blessed was his merry throat:
 And thus this sweetè clerk his timè spent,
 After his friendès' finding and his rent.'

The following gives a still more curious picture of life at the University. The warden and fellows of Solar Hall—so called because it was distinguished by possessing a solar, or upper story—grew their own corn, it appears, and had it ground for the use of the community at the mill at Trumpington. The miller is suspected of taking more than the customary toll, and Allen and Johan, two 'canny' clerks from Strother, in Fife, lay a plan to circumvent him:—

'Then weren therè poorè scholars two,
 That dwelten in the Hall of which I say;
 Testy they were, and lusty for to play;
 And, only for their mirth and revelry,
 Upon the warden busily they cry
 To give them leavè but a little stound,¹⁰
 To go to mill, and see their corn i-ground;
 And hardly they dursten lay their neck,
 The miller should not steal them half a peck
 Of corn by sightè, ne by force them reve.¹¹
 And at the last the warden gave them leave.
 John hight¹² that one, and Allen hight that other;
 Of one town were they born, that hightè Strother,
 Far in the North, I cannot telle where.
 This Allen maketh ready all his gear,
 And on an horse the sack he cast anon:
 Forth goeth Allen the clerk, and also John,
 With good sword and with buckler by their side.'

¹ Ornamented.² Sweet.³ The herb Valerian.⁴ The *μεγάλη Σφραγίς* of Ptolemy.⁵ An astronomical instrument.⁶ Belonging to.⁷ Stones used for counting on an abacus.⁸ Laid in order.⁹ A kind of cloth.¹⁰ Time.¹¹ Rob.¹² Was named.

We will leave Allen and John to pursue their adventure. They represented the class now commonly called 'fast men;' but Chaucer gives us an excellent specimen of the 'reading man,' in the character of the *Clerk of Oxenford* :—

' A Clerk there was of Oxenford also,
That unto logic haddè long igo.¹
All so lean was his horse as is a rake,
And he was not right fat, I undertake,
But lookèd hollow, and thereto² soberly.
Full thread-bare was his overest³ courtepy,⁴
For he had not yet got him a benefice,
Ne was not worthy to haven an office.
For him was lever⁵ have at his bed's head
Twenty bookès, clothèd in black and red,
Of Aristotle and his philosophy,
Than robès rich, or fiddle or psaltry.
But although he were a philosopher,
Yet haddè he but little gold in coffer;
But all that he might of his friendès hent,⁶
On bookès and on learning he it spent,
And busily gan for the soulès pray
Of them that gave him wherewith to scholay.⁷
Of study tooke he moste cure⁸ and heed;
Not one word spake he morè than was need;
All that he spake, it was of high prudènce,
And short and quick, and full of great sentence.⁹
Sounding in moral manner was his speech,
And gladly would he learn, and gladly teach.'

Here we observe the zeal for Aristotle's philosophy, for which Oxford is still distinguished, and which induced Dr. Arnold to give it the preference over every other University. Even in the fourteenth century, too, it appears Oxonians were remarkable for the same sententiousness of manner which is said to be their characteristic at the present day.

It naturally occurs to the reader to inquire whether Chaucer, during his life at the University, belonged to the set of Allen and John, or to that of the studious clerk. That he was always fond of reading he himself more than once assures us; and there are many traces of his familiarity with dialectics; but we should imagine that his studies were by no means confined to the trivium and quadrivium. We possess at least one poem of great merit, written while he was still at Cambridge, and breathing a spirit by no means clerical. It is called *The Court of Love*, and betokens a more familiar acquaintance with the 'Roman de la Rose' than with Aristotle or the schoolmen. Here is the dedication addressed to his lady :—

¹ Gone.² Moreover.³ Uppermost.⁴ Short cloak.⁵ It was more agreeable to him.⁶ Obtain.⁷ To pursue his studies in the schools.⁸ Care.⁹ Meaning.

' With timorous heart and trembling hand of dread,
Of cunning naked, bare of eloquence,
Unto the flower of port in womanhead¹
I write, as he that no intelligence
Of metres hath, ne flowers of sentence;
Save that me list my writing to convey,
In that I can to please her high nobley.

' The blossoms fresh of Tullius' garden sweet
Present they not, my matter for to borne;
Poems of Virgil taken here no root,
Ne craft of Galfride may not here sojourn:
Why n' am I cunning? Oh, well may I mourn,
For lack of science that I cannot write
Unto the princess of my life aright.'

Indeed at this period Chaucer appears to have resembled the young squire rather than the clerk; for no doubt 'He couldè songes well make and indite.' But this poem claims our attention for various reasons; it is not only our poet's earliest known production, but it is the type of all his early poems, and proves the connexion between the poetry of that age and the 'Courts of Love,' of which curious institutions Mr. Bell has given, in his Introduction, the only account that we know of in the whole circle of English literature. We shall, therefore, proceed to give a slight sketch of its general purport, with short extracts to illustrate the mode of its execution.

The youthful poet, under the fantastic name of 'Philogenet of Cambridge, Clerk,' at the age of eighteen resorts for the first time to the Court of the King and Queen of Love. The latter is complimented under the emblem of a Daisy,—in French, *Marguerite*; and this, combined with similar eulogiums on this emblem in many of his other poems, and in *The Testament of Love*, has induced many to believe that Chaucer, as well as Froissart, was patronised by the celebrated Margaret, Countess of Pembroke. Here, being chidden for the lateness of his coming, Philogenet does homage to the god, and swears to observe the twenty statutes of his realm. These are curious, as examples of the excessive veneration for the sex, introduced, or at least fostered, by the spirit of chivalry. For instance:—

' The twelfth statute remember to observe:
For all the pain thou hast for love and woe,
All is too lite² her mercy to deserve,
Thou musten think, whether thou ride or go;
And mortal woundes suffer thou also,
All for her sake, and think it well beset
Upon thy love, for it may not be bet.'³

¹ To her who is the perfection of feminine bearing. In old English, *head* in composition corresponds with the modern *hood*.

² Little.

³ For it may be no better bestowed than on her.

Again, a vein of humour runs through others; as the fifteenth:—

'The fifteenth statute,—Use to swear and stare,
And counterfeit a leasing¹ hardly
To save thy lady's honour everywhere,
And put thyself for her to fight boldly:
Say she is good, virtuous and ghostly,²
Clear of intent and heart, yea, thought and will,
And argue not for reason ne for skill

'Against thy lady's pleasure ne intent:
For love will not be counterpleaded indeed:
Say as she saith, then shalt thou not be shent,³
The crow is white; yea, truly, so I rede:⁴
And aye what thing that she will thee forbid
Eschew all that, and give her sovereignty,
Her appetite⁵ follow in all degree.'

After being chidden for his long delay to acknowledge the sovereignty of the god, Philogenet is conducted over the Court by Philobone, as Dante is by Beatrice. At the Temple of Venus he first sees a crowd of wretches complaining of the untruth of their lovers; but their number is far exceeded by myriads who are thanking the goddess for the perfect felicity which they have found in her service. The following is a noble passage, and forms the key to much that is unintelligible to modern readers in the theology and philosophy of the middle ages:—

'Yet eft again a thousand million,
Rejoicing love, leading their life in bliss:
They said:—"Venus, redress⁶ of all division,
Goddess eternal, thy name yherried⁷ is!
By lovè's band is knit all thing, ywis,⁸
Beast unto beast, the earth to water wan,
Bird unto bird, and woman unto man.

'This is the life of joy that we are in,
Resembling life of heavenly paradise;
Love is exiler aye of vice and sin;
Love maketh heartès lusty to devise;⁹
Honour and grace have they in every wise
That be to lovès law obedient;
Love maketh folk benign and diligent;

'Aye stirring them to dreadè vice and shame:
In their degree it maketh them honourable,
And sweet it is of love to bear the name,
So that his love be faithful, true, and stable:
Love pruneth him to seemen amiable;
Love hath no fault where it is exercised,
But sole with them that have all love despised.'

¹ A lie.

² Spiritual.

³ Blamed.

⁴ Advise.

⁵ Wish, desire.

⁶ Redresser.

⁷ Worship.

⁸ Truly.

⁹ Anxious to converse.

With this passage we would compare another in the same strain from the *Troilus and Cryseyde*. It is a song supposed to be sung by a Trojan maiden named Antigone.

'She said: Oh love, to whom I have and shall
Be humble subject, true in mine intent,
As I can best, to you, lord, give I all
For evermore mine heartès lys¹ to rent:
For never yet thy grace to no wight sent
So blissful cause as me, my life to lead
In allè joy and surety, out of dread.²

'Whom should I thankè but you, god of love,
Of all this bliss which that I bathè in?
And thanked be you, god, for that I love!
This is the rightè life that I am in,
To flemè³ allè manner vice and sin:
This doth 'me so to virtue to intend⁴
That day by day I am in will amend.⁵

Again, in the *Knight's Tale*:—

'The firstè mover of the cause above,
When He first made the fairè chain of love,
Great was th' effect, and high was his intent:
Well wist He why, and what thereof He meant;
For with that fairè chain of love He bond⁷
The fire, the water, the air, and eke the lond,⁸
In certain boundès that they may not fleè.'

Here it will be observed, that in Chaucer's philosophy the love of the sexes is only one manifestation of that great principle of love, called in theology 'charity,' which is the leading attribute of God, and binds together the Creator and every part of his creation in one golden chain. It is the bond of families and of human society. Hence the union of man and wife is considered not merely as analogous to the union of Christ with his Church, but as the same in kind, since both are but the result of the one great law of creation; and those who were content to forego the pleasures of conjugal love, were supposed to do so only because the lower manifestation of the great principle was absorbed in the higher. The Manichean doctrine, which represents earthly love as inherently sinful, formed no part of this philosophy. It taught, on the contrary, that love is a virtue, whatever be its object, but that the higher its object, the more ennobling the sentiment. The theology of the middle ages loved to dwell on those mysterious passages in S. John's Gospel and Epistles, which seem to us

¹ Pleasure. I give my heart's pleasure into your custody,

³ Banish.

⁴ Causes me.

⁵ To strive after virtue.

⁷ Bound.

⁸ Land.

² Without doubt.

⁶ Amended.

moderns to have no definite meaning, and to embody them in such hymns as, for example, the following:—

‘Jesu, corona virginum,
Quem mater illa concepit,
Que sola virgo parturit:
Hæc vota clemens accipe.

‘Qui pascis inter lilia,
Septus choreis virginum,
Sponsus decorans gloriâ,
Sponsisque reddens premia.’

Thus Chaucer’s monk wears a true-lover’s knot as an emblem of his profession, and the nun a crowned A, with the motto, ‘*Amor vincit omnia.*’ Hence, also, there appeared no incongruity in prelates of the Church holding offices in the Courts of Love. Wherever love was observed to exist in any part of the creation, there it was honoured as a direct emanation from the Deity; for ‘God is love, and every one that loveth is of God.’ And, therefore, Chaucer meant no irreverence in representing the birds on S. Valentine’s-day as singing a sort of parody on the Matins for Trinity Sunday, and offering their homage to the great sustaining Power of nature in the very words of Scripture. This idea, like every other, is no doubt liable to corruption, and was, in fact, the foundation of the ancient forms of pantheism; but every false religion that ever found acceptance with the human mind is founded upon some truth lying deep in man’s nature, and is but the expression of cravings which can find their safe and adequate gratification only in the catholic faith. They are efforts to ‘feel after God,’ if haply He may be found in the inner consciousness of that soul which He created after his own image, and breathed into man’s nostrils.

But to return to *The Court of Love*. After wandering for a time under the direction of Philobone, Philogenet is introduced to the presence of the Lady Rosial, whom he at once recognises as the subject of his day-dreams, and adopts as his mistress. She accepts him as her lover after some delay, and directs Philobone to initiate him further into the mysteries of the Court. Here occurs an *hiatus*, which Mr. Bell has been unable to fill up, as no MS. of this poem is known to exist. When the poem resumes, Rosial is inviting Philogenet to remain at the Court till May-day, when the birds sing a solemn service to the God:—

‘On May-day, when the lark began to rise,
To matins went the lusty nightingale,
Within a temple shapen hawthorn-wise;
He might not sleep in all the nightertale,¹

¹ Season of night.

But *Domine, labia*, 'gan he cry and gale,¹
 "My lippès open, Lord of Love, I cry,
 And let my mouth thy praising now bewry."²

* * * * *
 'The turtle-dove said, "Welcome, welcome, May,
 Gladsome and light to lovers that ben true!
 I thank thee, Lord of Love, that dost purvey
 For me to read this lesson all of due;
 For in good sooth of courage I pursue
 To serve my make³ till death us must depart:"
 And then *Tu autem* sang he all apart.'

We need hardly remind our readers that *Tu autem, Domine, miserere nobis*, was said by the reader immediately after he had read each lesson in the service for Matins.

This poem is, on the face of it, a description of an imaginary court, where the king and queen of love act as the viceroys of the god and goddess; but the names seem to point to an esoteric meaning. The god of love, as it appears to us, means simply the Deity; the king and queen, the catholic Church, his representative on earth. Philogenet, that is, one who loves the creature, is led by Philobone, the lover of moral good, to resort to the Church; there he swears fealty to the god, and promises obedience to his statutes; that is, he is initiated by baptism, and makes his baptismal vow. He is then accepted by Rosial, who represents divine grace, and is permitted to join in the solemn worship offered by all loving creatures to Him who is, in the truest sense, the God of Love.

This poem, and *The Assembly of Fowls, or Parliament of Birds, The Cuckoo and the Nightingale*, and *The Flower and the Leaf*, are all written in the same allegorical taste. The last has been translated by Dryden, and has lost less of its original character in the process than any other of Chaucer's poems. The following passages from the *Parliament of Birds* are curious and very spirited:—

'The weary hunter, sleeping in his bed,
 To wood again his mind goeth anon;
 The judge dreameth how his pleas be sped;
 The carter dreameth how his cartès gone;
 The rich of gold; the knight fights with his fone;⁴
 The sickè met⁵ he drinketh of the tun;
 The lover met he hath his lady won.'

This, as Mr. Bell observes in the note, is evidently the original of Mercutio's lively description of Queen Mab and her inspirations, in 'Romeo and Juliet.' The following enumeration of the trees which adorned a garden is highly poetical, from the bold-

¹ Sing aloud.

² Show forth.

³ Mate.

⁴ Foes.

⁵ Dreams.

ness of the figure by which they are personified, and the extraordinary contrast of the ideas which this personification suggests. It has been appropriated almost word for word by Spenser:—

'The builder¹ oak, and eke the hardy ash,
The pillar² elm, the coffer unto carraine,³
The box pipe-tree, the cypress, death to 'plain,
The shooter ewe, the aspe for shaftes plain,
The olive of peace, and eke the drunken vine,
The victor palm, the laurel, too, divine.'⁴

The various birds, assembled before Dame Nature on S. Valentine's-day, are called upon to determine the conflicting claims of several candidates for the possession of a beautiful female eagle. The falcon, like a warrior-bird, says, 'Let them appeal to the trial by battle.' The water-fowls, who seem to be considered a very low-bred race, are next called upon:—

'And for these water-fowls then began
The goose to speak, and, in her cackeling,
She said, "Peace now, take keep every man,
And hearken what a reason I shall forth bring!
My wit is sharp, I love no tarrying!
I say I rede⁵ him, though he were my brother,
But⁶ she will love, let him love another."

' "Lo! here a perfect reason of a goose!"
Quoth the spar hawk. "Never may she the!⁷
Lo such a thing it is to have a tongue loose!
Now pardi, fool, yet were it better for thee
Have held thy peace than showed thy nicety;⁸
It lieth not in his wit nor in his will,
But, sooth is said, a fool cannot be still."

* * * * *

' "Nay, God forbid a lover should change!"
The turtle said, and waxed for shame all red;
"Though that his lady evermore be strange,
Yet let him serve her alway till he be dead.
Forsooth I praise not the geoses rede;
For though she died, I would none other make;⁹
I will be hers till that the death me take."

But while Chaucer was indulging his imagination in these ingenious fables, he was forming his style, and acquiring facility and copiousness of expression by translating two works which exercised a vast influence over the opinion of that age, 'Boethius de Consolatione Philosophiæ,' and the 'Roman de la Rose.' From the former, Petrarch, Dante, Boccaccio, and our

¹ So called, because the most durable for building.

² Because planted as a pillar to support the vine.

³ Used for making coffins for carrion, or corpses.

⁴ Called divine, because sacred to Apollo, god of divination.

⁵ Advise.

⁶ Except.

⁷ Thrive.

⁸ Folly.

⁹ Mate.

poet, obtained most of their knowledge of the Platonic philosophy; while John of Meun's great satirical poem fostered, if it did not give birth to, the communism in politics and free-thinking in religion, which are observable in much of the literature of this period. Indeed, it was eminently a revolutionary age. The rising of the *Jacquerie* under Jack Straw, and the movements of the Albigeois in the south of France, were all of a character partly political and partly religious; and even the tenets of Wickliffe might have served as a text-book for one of M. Louis Blanc's lectures on the rights of labour at the national *ateliers*, as has been shown by the late publication of his tracts, under the supervision of Dr. Todd. Of the translations of Boethius, we shall only say that as a study of the language of the fourteenth century, it is most valuable; and for an analysis of the curious and elaborate allegory of the 'Roman de la Rose,' we must refer our readers to Mr. Bell's introduction to Chaucer's translation. We shall extract, however, the following account of the authors of the original poem:—

'The "Roman de la Rose" is the earliest poem of its class in French literature. It consists of 22,000 verses, and was commenced by Guillaume de Lorris, who, after proceeding as far as 4,070 verses, died in 1260. The allegory was afterwards taken up and completed by Jean de Meun. Moreri and the biographical collections assign 1279 or 1280 as the date of Jean de Meun's birth; yet it is certain that in 1284 he translated the *Ars militaris* of Vegetius. Jehan le Maire, of Belgium, concludes from this circumstance that he must have been contemporaneous with Dante, who was born in 1265. Jean de Meun is supposed to have died about 1318.

'There was little in common between the genius of the two authors; and the parts they contributed to the poem are, consequently, distinguished by very different characteristics. Guillaume de Lorris possessed great constructive art, effectively displayed in the conduct of the allegory, remarkable skill in portraiture, rich invention, and exuberant fancy. Jean de Meun, on the other hand, was essentially a satirist; the poetical faculty in him was subordinate to more practical qualities; and his share of the work, deficient in imagination and variety, abounds in wit, sarcasm, and licentiousness. His revolutionary and dissolute doctrines produced a storm. The poem was denounced from the pulpit as a work subversive of religion, order, and social security; and the ladies of the Court of Philippe le Bel, are said to have conspired to procure his condemnation to death by blows of sticks, in revenge for his having written profanely of their sex.

Chaucer's translation, consisting of 7,699 verses, proceeds only as far as verse 13,105 of the original, where Malebouche kneels down to confess. Out of these 13,105 verses, 5,544 are passed over in the translation; but whether this passage, embodying as it does the violent democratic principles and communist doctrines of Jean de Meun, were omitted by Chaucer, or suppressed on account of their perilous tendency by the copyist, must be left to conjecture.'

As a specimen of Jean de Meun's respect for kings, we give the following passage, in the original, from Meun's edition. It is omitted in Chaucer's version. The poet is describing the origin of monarchy:—

'Ung grant vilain entr'eus eslurent,
Le plus ossu de quanqu' ils furent,
Le plus corase, le plus greignor,
Si le firent prince et seignor.'

Which may be thus translated. 'They [that is, the people] 'elected from among themselves some great churl, the most 'bony of them all, the boldest and tallest; and him they 'made prince and lord.' They assign him a demesne for his support, on condition that he will lead them in battle. He now gathers a number of idlers about his court, who pillage and oppress the people; and when his subjects entreat him to defend them against these harpies, he makes a further demand of taxes to maintain a standing army.

'Cil jura qu'adroit les tendroit,
Et que lors loges deffendroit,
Se chascuns en droit soi le livre
Des biens dont il se puisse vivre.'

'He swore that he would do them justice, and defend their 'houses, if each gave up to him a part of their substance to support 'himself with.' Philip the Fair was certainly more liberal than most modern princes in maintaining at his court the man who published sentiments so calculated to bring authority into contempt. But John of Meun goes further than this, and complains of the injustice of permitting any man to possess more than is necessary for his own support, while others are in want.

The allegorical personages described in the opening of the poem, which was written by William of Lorris, are very spirited. They have supplied Buckhurst and Spenser with many a hint. On the outside of the wall enclosing the garden in which blossoms the rose, are painted figures of those vices most opposed to the virtue of love, just as indecent figures and grinning demons are carved on the gurgoyles of churches; and amongst the rest, Covetousness.

'And next was painted covetise,
That eggeth¹ folk in many guise,
To take, and give right nought again,
And great treasures up to lain.²
And that is³ that for usure
Lendeth to many a creature
The less⁴ for the more winning,
So covetous is her burning.
And that is that pennies fele⁴
Teacheth for to rob and steal
These thieves and these small har-
lots;⁵
And that is routh,⁶ for by their
throats
Full many one hangeth at the last.
She maketh folk compass and cast

To taken other folk's thing,
Through robbery or miscoveting.
And that is she that maketh treach-
ours.
And she maketh false pleadoirs
That with their termes and their
dooms⁷
Do⁸ maidens, children, and eke
grooms,
Their heritage to forego.
Full crooked were her handes two,
For covetise is ever wood⁹
To gripen other folk's good.
Covetise for her winning
Full leef¹⁰ hath other menn's thing.'

¹ Inciteth.² To lay.³ And that is she.⁴ Many.⁵ Dissolute persons of either sex.⁶ Pity.⁷ Judgments.⁸ Cause.⁹ Mad.¹⁰ Dear.

The allegorical pictures of John of Meun are not nearly so spirited as these; but in that of *Elde* or Old Age, at least, Chaucer has added some admirable traits to the original.

'Where Eld abit¹ I will thee tell
Shortly, and no while dwell,
For thither behoveth thee to go.
If Death in youth² thee not slo,³
Of this journey thou maist not fail.
With her Labour and Travail
Lodged be, with Sorrow and Woe,
That never out of her court go.
Pain and Distress, Sickness and Ire,

And Melancholy, that angry sire,
Be of her palace senators.
Groaning and Grudging her her be-
jours;³
The day and night, her to torment
With cruel Death they her present,
And tellen her, early and late,
That Death standeth armed at her
gate.'

This fine image of Groaning and Grudging, the gentlemen ushers in the Court of Old Age, always representing to her that Death is standing armed at the gate, and clamouring for admittance, is an addition of Chaucer's. The original, given in the note, is tame in comparison.

'Travail et Dolor la hebergent,
Mes ils la tient et ensergent,
Et tant la batent et tormentent,
Que mort prochaine li presentent.'

But the rancorous hatred he bore to the friars imparted more than ordinary vigour to John of Meun's pen; and it is in his satirical pictures of them that his genius seems to revel. False-Semblant, or Hypocrisy, is among the barons of the god of love who join in the attack upon the castle where the Rose is guarded; and gives a long account of himself, from which we shall extract some passages:—

'Sir, I will fill, so mote I go,
My paunch of good⁴ meat and wine,
As should a master of divine;⁴
For though that I me poor⁵ feign,
Yet allè poor folk I disdain.
I love better the acquaintance,
Ten timè, of the King of France,
Than of a poor man of mild mood,
Though that his soul be all as good.
For when I see beggars quaking
Naked, on mixens⁵ all stinking,
For hunger cry, and eke for care,
I intermit⁶ not of their fare.
They be so poor and full of pine

They might not once give me a dine,⁷
For they have nothing but their life;
What should he give that licketh his
knife?
It is but folly to intermit
To seek in houndès' nest fat meat.
Let bear them to the 'spital anon,
But, for me, comfort get they none.
But a sick rich usurer
Would I visit and draw near;
Him would I comfort and reheate,⁸
For I hope of his gold to get;
And if that wicked Death him have,
I will go with him in his grave.'

This last line alludes to the custom, which prevailed extensively, of being buried in the habit of S. Francis. False-Semblant, and Constrained-Abstinence, his companion, presently

¹ Abideth.² Slay.³ *Maitres d'hôtel*, or ushers.⁴ Divinity.⁵ Dunghills.⁶ Meddle.⁷ A dinner.⁸ Cheer.

set out on an expedition to deceive Wicked-Tongue, the keeper of the gate. Their array is thus described:—

'And Dame Abstinence'-strained
Took of a robe of cameline,
And 'gan her graithe¹ as a *Beguine*.²
A large coverchef of thread
She wrapped all about her head;
But she forgot not her psalter.
A pair of beades eke she bare
Upon a lace all of white thread,
On which that she her beades bid.³

* * * * *
And False-Semblant, scynt,⁴ *je vous dis*,
And, as it were for such mistere,
Done on the cope of a frere,

Having arrived at the gate, Constrained-Abstinence thus addresses Wicked-Tongue:—

"Sir," said 'strained-Abstinence,
"We for to drie⁵ our penance,
With heartes piteous and devout
Are come, as pilgrims go about;
Well nigh on foot alway we go;
Full dusty be our heelès two;
And thus bothe we be sent,
Throughout the world that is miswent,

With cheer simple and full piteous;
His looking was not disdainous,
Ne proud, but meek and full peace-
able.

About his neck he bare a Bible,
And squirely forth 'gan he gon;⁶
And for to rest his limbs upon,
He had of treason a potent,⁷
As he were feeble his way he went.
But in his sleeve he 'gan to thring⁷
A razor sharp and well biting,
That was forged in a forge,
Which that men clepen Coupe-gorge.⁸

To give example and preach also.
To fishen sinful men we go,
For other fishing no fish we.
And, sir, for that charity,
As we be wont harbour we crave
Your life t' amende; Christ it save!"

It is curious to observe how Chaucer, in the *Sompnour's Tale*, expands this sketch into one of his most successful pictures of contemporary manners. The monks and friars, indeed, received no quarter from either John of Meun or his translator; but the former, to judge by his works, was not a believer in Christianity; and Chaucer's own morals were not such as to qualify him for the office of a censor of the clergy. But unbelievers and profligates are always the most easily scandalized by clerical delinquencies.

All these poems were probably written before the poet's marriage, supposed to have taken place in the year 1360, or soon after. What were his more serious occupations, during the long interval between his sojourn at the University and his thirty-first year, there is no satisfactory clue to discover. He may, as Speght supposes, have been studying law at the Temple, where he is said to have incurred a fine for beating a friar in Fleet Street; or he may have been serving his apprenticeship to chivalry in the household of some of the high nobility. His knowledge of the law and lawyers, observable throughout his writings, and his accurate pictures of the roguish manciple of the Temple, would seem to favour the former supposition; but what profession or branch of learning was he not intimate with?

¹ Clothe. ² A member of a religious order, so called. ³ Said her prayers.
⁴ Girded, *cinctus*. ⁵ Go. ⁶ Staff. ⁷ Thrust. ⁸ Endure.

The next authentic record of his life brings us to the year 1360, when he accompanied Edward III. in the French campaign; was taken prisoner, and liberated in the same year, probably on the conclusion of peace at Chartres. It was perhaps during this campaign that he was noticed by John of Gaunt, the youthful Earl of Richmond, whose marriage with his cousin Blanche, the sole heiress of the House of Lancaster, which took place in 1359, we find the poet celebrating, in one of his favourite allegories, entitled *Chaucer's Dream*; and from some allusions in the same poem we learn that the poet himself was married at the same time, or very soon after. This poem, like the *Romaunt of the Rose*, is written in dimetre iambics—a metre to which he had probably become reconciled by his study of the latter poem. It exhibits Chaucer's increasing powers of easy narrative and picturesque description, and affords many interesting pictures of the stately manners and high-bred courtesy of the Norman aristocracy.

Chaucer has now attained the mature age of thirty-two. He has established his fame as a soldier and a poet; and his marriage with Philippa, sister of Katherine Roet, a favourite attendant on the Duchess Blanche, and destined to succeed her as Duchess of Lancaster, brings him into more intimate relations with the Duke. The tide of Court favour now flows rapidly upon him. In 1366 the Queen confers a pension on his wife; and in 1367 he is made valet of the King's chamber; an office which, says Selden, was conferred on young heirs designed to be knighted, or young gentlemen of great descent and family. If Chaucer had been of great descent, we should no doubt have heard of it; we are, therefore, not disposed to question the tradition mentioned by Speght, and confirmed by the meanness of the poet's coat-of-arms, which at that period indicated in some degree the quality of their bearer, that his family was engaged in commerce. But his eminently social qualities, and keen appreciation of character, no doubt pointed him out to his royal master as a valuable diplomatic agent; and in 1370 he is absent from England on the king's service,—in what particular mission cannot now be ascertained. If a due appreciation of literary attainments be any proof of civilization, we must pronounce the age when Chaucer, Gower, and Froissart were courted by princes, and when Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, collected and translated the classics, to be in advance of that in which the Reformers, as Fuller relates, used these precious MSS. for the basest purposes, and strewed the quadrangle of Trinity with pages on which were perhaps preserved the lost decade of Livy.

In this his first diplomatic service the poet probably acquitted himself to the satisfaction of the Court; for in 1372, being now, according to the common computation, forty-four, he was joined

in a commission with certain citizens of Genoa to treat with the Duke, citizens, and merchants of that state, and to choose an English seaport where a Genoese factory might be established. From documents preserved in the Record Office, it appears that, in the execution of his mission, he visited not only Genoa, but Florence. We cannot help thinking that, in seeking employment in Italy, he was chiefly influenced by a desire to extend his knowledge of his art by personal intercourse with all, or some of the great poets who were then forming the basis of a native Italian literature. Edward III., also, was a man to be proud of the literary attainments of one of his servants, and to desire that his own taste should be appreciated in the person of his ambassador. But, alas! we are left in the dark as to all the particulars of this visit to Italy. Would that Chaucer had been animated by the spirit of the excellent Seigneur of Joinville, the 'Boswellizer' of S. Louis, whose diary is second only to that of Pepys in minuteness and *naïveté*! We should then perhaps have heard of Chaucer's meeting with Petrarch in the humble retreat where he retired to die among the olives and vines of the Eugean hills; his delight as he listened to the words of Virgil, Livy, and Statius, read with the true Latin intonation preserved in the vernacular of the Italians; his impressions as Petrarch related the touching story of Griselda, and Boccaccio translated for him some of the Homeric ballads; his surprise as they unfolded, in words that burned, the prospects and designs of the Ghibelline party, and the Utopian day-dreams of a perfect republic, based upon the eternal principles of reason and truth, which Dante had taught them to indulge. Then we should perhaps have had a clue to the seeming countenance which Chaucer affords in his writings to the revolutionary and communist doctrines advanced by Wickliffe. We should learn how he bought a Virgil from the copyist who kept the bookstall by the 'parvis' of our Lady's Church at Genoa; how Petrarch and Boccaccio presented him with copies of their works; how, while he admired the grandeur of the 'Divina Comedia,' he thought the 'Filostrato,' the 'Theseide,' and the 'Decameron' more in accordance with the practical and homely character of the English mind, and therefore the fitter models for one who, like himself, desired to be a popular writer. And we should no doubt find him determining to introduce a new spirit into the literature of his country, to desert the allegorical gardens and fountains which had hitherto fascinated his youthful imagination, and to seek for inspiration from thenceforth in the highways of real life.

This picture may seem fanciful; but Chaucer's subsequent career, both literary and political, shows that his visit to Italy

had the effect here described upon his tastes and sentiments. The poems produced after this period all bear traces of it. The *Troilus and Cryseyde* is founded upon Boccaccio's 'Filostrato'; into the body of it is introduced one of Petrarch's sonnets. *The Knight's Tale* is taken from Boccaccio's poem called the 'Theseide.' Throughout them all are numerous allusions to Dante, and translations of short sentences from the 'Divina Comedia'; everywhere are displayed a more accurate knowledge of Latin authors, and some acquaintance at least with Homer, who, it will be remembered, was first introduced to Western Europe by Boccaccio. But it is the general ease, force, and definiteness of Chaucer's views and taste subsequently to this period, which indicate, in our opinion, his intercourse, either personally or through their works, with the great Italians, who were undoubtedly at the head of opinion and literature in the fourteenth century.

On his return from his Italian mission he is loaded with favours. In 1372 John of Gaunt grants a pension to his wife; in 1374 and the two following years he is successively appointed Comptroller of the Customs in the port of London, allowed a pitcher of wine daily for the use of his household, and made 'committee' of the person and estate of the son of Edmond Staplegate, of Bilsinton in Kent, one of the king's wards. The office of guardian was one of considerable emolument, at the expense of the heir. In 1376 he is attached to the embassy of Sir John Burley; in 1377 he is sent to Flanders in the suite of Sir Thomas Percy, afterwards Earl of Worcester. On the death of his patron, Edward III., in the June of the same year, his pensions are continued by the young king, who employs him, in conjunction with Sir Guichard d'Angle, in negotiating the treaty for his marriage with the daughter of the French monarch. In 1378 he is attached to a second embassy to Lombardy, during which he leaves his friend, the poet Gower, to superintend his numerous affairs at home. In 1382, to his other pensions and offices is added that of Comptroller of the Petty Customs. Altogether, as Mr. Bell computes, his income from his pensions and places alone, without computing perquisites, must at this period have been at least equal to the salary of the Chief-Justice of the Common Pleas and the Chief-Baron of the Exchequer.

Here, then, was an instance of a poet who did not share the common fate of his brethren of the tuneful art. He was rich and honoured by the world, and reaped the fruits of his talents in his lifetime. But his day was approaching. In 1386 he was elected knight of the shire for the important county of Kent. This he, no doubt, considered a high honour, and welcomed as an opportunity of furthering the Ghibelline principles which he

had espoused; but it was indeed the beginning of all his misfortunes.

‘Quæ præclara et prospera tanto,
Ut rebus lætis par sit mensura malorum?’

This Parliament was eminently hostile to the party of John of Gaunt, with whom the poet was connected by the ties of friendship and interest; and it is probable that, in the course of the debates, he drew on himself the resentment of Thomas, Duke of Gloucester, who succeeded his patron in the ministry. In 1386 a commission was issued to inquire into alleged abuses in the department of the subsidies and customs, and the late Member for Kent was deprived of both his offices, which yielded him the bulk of his income.

Mr. Godwin, in his fanciful life of the poet, has taken it for granted that his dismissal was the result of his supposed participation in the popular insurrections which followed on the election of John of Northampton to the Mayoralty in 1382. Chaucer is supposed to have been obliged to fly from justice, first to Hainault, the seat of his wife's family, and next to Zealand, whence he was obliged to return in consequence of the dishonesty of his friends at home, who embezzled his property and left him in want. On his arrival in England, he is supposed to have been arrested and committed to the Tower, where he remained for three years. Richard II. having, in 1389, taken the government into his own hands, is then supposed to have released him at the entreaty of the queen, Anne of Bohemia, on condition that he should inform against his associates. This circumstantial history Godwin constructed from some allusions in Chaucer's allegorical treatise entitled ‘The Testament of Love.’

It would be rash to convict a man like Chaucer of the baseness of betraying his confederates, on the testimony of an allegory written with no intention, apparently, of giving the details of his life. Exile, prison, false friends, treason, rebellion, and confession of error, have all so obvious an allegorical reference to the state of the soul and its temptations, of which the ‘Testament of Love’ expressly treats, that there is no necessity to suppose that they refer to actual events. But, in fact, the whole fabric raised by Godwin has been demolished by Sir Harris Nicolas, who has shown, from documents still in existence, that ‘Chaucer was at large in London from 1380 to 1388, having, ‘throughout the whole of that period, received his pension half-yearly at the Exchequer with his own hands. It is certain, also, ‘that he held both his offices in the Customs up to December, 1384. ‘In November, 1384, when, according to the narrative, he must ‘have been in Zealand, he was obtaining permission to absent

'himself for a month from his duties; in the following February 'he was allowed to discharge them by deputy; and at the very 'moment when he is supposed to have been a prisoner in the 'Tower, he was sitting in Parliament as knight of the shire, 'for one of the largest counties in England.' It is satisfactory to find the moral character of one so highly endowed with intellect, thus vindicated from the unjust opprobrium with which it was gratuitously loaded.

During the period of his active employment and increasing prosperity, literature appears to have been his amusement, as it was his consolation in his hours of misfortune and despondency. Like Charles Lamb, every moment that he could snatch from the ledger he gave to the muses. Here is his own account of his manner of spending his time, taken from *The House of Fame*—one of the most admirable burlesque poems in the English language, which Pope thought he could improve, and has accordingly spoiled. An eagle sent by Jupiter is supposed to carry the poet away in his talons, and thus explains the object of his mission:—

"First, I, that in my feet have thee,
Of which thou hast a fear and wonder,
Am dwelling with the God of Thunder,
Which that men callen Jupiter,
That doth me flee full oft far,
To do all his commandment.
And for this cause he hath me sent
To thee: now hearkè, by thy truth!
Certain he hath of thee great ruth,¹
That thou so longè, truly,
Hast served so attentively
His blind Nephew Cupido,
And fairè Venus also,
Withoutè guerdon ever yet;
And nevertheless hast set thy wit
(Although in thy head full lite² is),
To makè bookès, songs, and ditties,
In rhyme, or ellès in cadence,
As thou best canst, in reverence
Of Love, and of his servant's eke,
That have his service sought, and
seek.
And painest thou to praise his art,
Although thou haddest never part;
Wherefore, all so God me bless,
Jovès halt³ it great humblesse,
And virtue eke, that thou wilt make
A' night full oft thine head to ache,

In thy study so thou writest,
And evermore of love enditest,
In honour of him and praisings,
And in his folkès furtherings,
And in their matter all devisest,
And nought him nor his folk despisest;
Although thou maist go in the dance
Of them that him list⁴ not advance.
Wherefore, as I said, ywis,⁵
Jupiter considereth well this;
And also, beausire, other things;
That is, that thou hast no tidings
Of Lovès folk, if they be glad,
Ne of nought ellès that God made;
And not only of far country,
That there no tiding cometh to thee,
Not of thy very neighbours
That dwelleth almost at thy doors,
Thou hearest neither that nor this;
For when thy labour done all is,
And hast ymadè reckonings,
Instead of rest and newè things,
Thou goest home to thy house anon,
And, all as dumb as any stone,
Thou sittest at another book,
Till fully dased is thy look,
And livest then as an heremite,
Although thine abstinence is lite."

The 'reckonings' here mentioned are supposed to allude to the accounts of the Comptroller's office.

¹ Pity.

² Little.

³ Holdeth.

⁴ *Him list* means, is pleasing to him, or he likes.

⁵ Truly.

The House of Fame has not attracted so much attention as, in our opinion, it deserves. Warton supposes it to be a translation from the French—a supposition for which there are no grounds, and, in the course of his remarks, he displays an amazing want of perception, and ignorance of mediæval language. It is introduced by a sort of philosophical investigation into the nature of dreams, conceived in a style of covert humour which is highly characteristic of Chaucer:—

'God turn us every dream to good!
For it is wondrous thing, by the Rood,
To my wit, what causes swevens¹
Either on morrows or on evens;
And why th' effect followeth of some,
And of some it shall never come;
Why this is an avision,
Why this a revelation:
Why this a dream, why that a sweven,
And not to every man like even;
Why this a phantom, why that oracles,
I n'ot² but whoso of these miracles
The causes knoweth bet than I,
Divine he; for I, certainly,
Ne ken them not, ne never think
Too busily my wit to swink,³
To know of their significance,
The gendres, neither the distance
Of times of them, ne the causes,
For why this more than that cause is;
As if folkes' complexions
Make them dream of reflections, &c.

But at my beginning, trusteth well,
I will make invocation,
With special devotion,
Unto the God of Sleep anon,
That dwelleth in a cave of stone,
Upon a stream that cometh from Lethe,
That is, a flood of Hell unsweetè,
Beside a folk men clepeth Cimmérie;
There sleepeth, aye, this god unmerry,
With his thousand sleepy sonnes,
That alway for to sleep their won⁴ is.

And to this god that I of read,
Pray I that he would me speed
My sweven for to tell aright,
If every dream stand in his might.
And He that Mover is of all,
That is, and was, and ever shall;
So give them joyè that it hear,
Of alle that they dream to-year;
And for to stand all in the grace
Of their lovès, or in what place
That them were levest for to stond;
And shield them from povert and
shond,
And from unhap and each disease,
And send them all that may them
plense,
That take it well, and scorn it not,
Ne it misdeemè in their thought
Through malicious intention.
An[d whoso through presumption,
Or hate, or scorn, or through envy,
Despite, or jape, or villany,
Misdeem it, pray I Jesus God,
That dream he barefoot, dream he shod;
That every harm that any man
Hath had since that the world began,
Befal him thereof ere he starve,⁵
And grant he may it full deserve,
Lo! with such conclusion
As had of his avision,
Croesus, that was king of Lyde,
That high upon a gibbet died.
This prayer shall he have of me,—
I am no bet in charity.'

After seeing the story of Æneas and Dido painted on the walls of a palace of crystal, the poet is carried off by the eagle, as already mentioned. There is much humour in his conjectures about his probable fate.

'O God, thought I, that madest
kind,⁶
Shall I no other wayès die?
Whether Jovès will me stellifie?⁷

Or what thing may this signify?
I neither am Enoch nor Elye,
Ne Romulus, ne Ganymede,
That was ybore up, as men read,

¹ Dreams or visions.

² Ne wot—know not.

³ Labour. ⁴ Wont, custom.

⁵ Die.

⁶ Nature.

⁷ Make a star of me.

To heaven, with Dom Jupiter,
And made the Goddes' botiller.
Lo! this was then my fantasy!
But he that bare me 'gan espy
That I so thought, and saide this:—

"Thou doest of thyself amiss;
For Jove is not thereabout,
I dare well put thee out of doubt,
To make of thee, as yet, a star."

There is something very comical in the idea of Ganymede being made butler to the gods, and the poet's supposition that his apotheosis is incontinently about to take place.

The eagle then describes how every word spoken upon earth is borne to the House of Fame.

"——Take heed now
By experience; for if that thou
Throw on water now a stone,
West wost¹ thou how it will make
anon
A little roundel as a circle,
Peraunter² broad as a covercle;³
And right anon thou shalt see well
That circle will cause another wheel;
And that the third, and so forth,
brother,
Every circle causing other,
Wider than himselfe was.

And right thus every word, ywis,
That loud or privy yspoken is,
Moveth first an air about
And of this moving, out of doubt,
Another air anon is moved,
As I have of the water proved,
That every circle causeth other.
Right so of air, my levè⁴ brother;
Every airè other stirreth
More and more, and speech up-bearreth,
Or voice, or noise, or word, or soun,⁵
Aye thorough multiplication,
Till it be at the House of Fame—
Take it in earnest or in game."

This is what Barrow enumerates among the various species of wit, under the description of 'acute nonsense.'

The second book is occupied with an exceedingly humorous dialogue between the eagle and the poet, in which the former describes the various objects which meet them in the aerial flight. The third book opens with the following quaint invocation:—

'O God of science and of light,
Apollo, through thy greaté might,
This little last book thou guye!⁶
Not that I wilne,⁷ for maistrie,⁸
Here art poetical be shewed;
But for the rhyme is light and lewd,⁹
Yet make it somewhat agreeable,
Though some verse fail in a syllable;
And that I do no diligence
To shewè craft, but only sentence.¹⁰

And if, divine Virtue, thou
Wilt helpe me to shewè now
What in mine head ymaked is
(Lo! that is for to meaneen this,
The House of Fame to describe),
Thou shalt see me go as blive¹¹
Unto the next laurel I see,
And kiss it, for it is thy tree.
Now entreth in my breast anon.'

The poet next sees the Goddess herself, who is described in the light and easy manner of a troubadour who had just been reading Virgil and Ovid. For an analysis of the poem, we must refer the reader to Mr. Bell's introduction. We shall add one more extract. The House of Fame is built of wicker, sixty miles in length, and ever whirling round, and in it all the

¹ Wottest, knowest.

² Peraventure.

³ Lid of a pot. ⁴ Dear.

⁵ Sound.

⁶ Guide thou.

⁷ Desire.

⁸ Emulation.

⁹ Unlearned.

¹⁰ Meaning.

¹¹ Quickly.

tidings in the world, and the shadows of those who on earth had uttered them, are collected.

'And every wight that I saw there
Rounded¹ every in other's ear,
A new² tiding privily,
Or elles told all openly,
Right thus, and said, "N^ost³ not thou
What is betidde,⁴ lo, right now?"
"No," quoth he, "telle me what."
And then he told him this and that,
And swore thereto that it was sooth:
"Thus hath he said," and "Thus he
doth."
And "Thus shall it be," and "Thus
heard I say."
"That shall be found, that dare I lay."
That all the folk that is alive
Ne have the cunning to describe
The thinges that I heard⁵ there,
What aloud, and what in ear.
But all the wonder most was this:
When one had heard a thing, ywis
He came further to another wight,
And 'gan him tellen anon right.
The sam^e thing that him was told
Ere it a furlong-way was old;
And 'gan somewhat for to eche⁶
To this tiding in his speech,
More than it ever was.
* * * Then north and south
Went every mothe⁷ from mouth to
mouth;
And that increasing evermo,
As fire is wont to quick⁸ and go

From a sparkle sprung amiss
Till all a city burnt up is.
And when that was full ysprung,
And waxen more on every tongue
Than ever it was, it went anon
Up to a window out to gon;
Or, but it might⁹ out there pass,
It 'gan out creep at some crevass,
And flew forth fast¹⁰ for the nonce.
And sometime saw I then at once
A leasing and a sad-sooth⁷ saw
That 'gonnè⁸ of adventure thraw⁹
Out of a window for to pass;
And when they metten in that place
They were acheeked bothè two,
And neither of them must out go,
For other so they 'gonne crowd,
Till each of them 'gan cryen loud—
"Let me go first!" "Nay, but let me!
And here I will assure thee
With vowes, if thou wilt do so,
That I shall never from thee go,
But be thine owne sworn brother.
We will mingle us each with other,
That no man, be they never so wrath,
Shall have one, or two, but both
At on^e, as beside his leave
Come we on morrow or on eve;
Be we cried or still yrowned."¹⁰
Thus saw I false and sooth compounded,
Together flee for one tiding.'

How full of light and frolicsome fancy is this explanation of the inseparable union of truth and falsehood in every relation of incidents! It recalls to one's mind Sir Walter Raleigh's vain endeavour to obtain an accurate account of what had just occurred in the court-yard beneath his window.

It is almost impossible to determine whether this admirable allegory, or the *Troilus and Cryseyde*, were first in the order of time. Mr. Bell mentions the assertion of Lydgate, that the latter was written in Chaucer's youth; but this is not incompatible with the supposition that it was subsequent to his first visit to Italy. It is a translation, or, to speak more correctly, it is founded upon Boccaccio's 'Filostrato.' Mr. Bell has, in the introduction, traced the origin of the well-known story of Cressida's unfaithfulness to the prose romance of 'Guido de Collonna,' from whom Boccaccio probably derived it; and having

¹ Whispered. ² Ne wottest. ³ Happened. ⁴ Add. ⁵ Word.
⁶ Kindle. ⁷ Seriously true. ⁸ Begun. ⁹ Struggle. ¹⁰ Whispered.

clothed it in Tuscan, addressed it to his mistress, the natural daughter of Robert, King of Naples, whom he called by the pet name of 'la Fiammetta.' But Chaucer has departed widely from his Italian model; and in doing so has imparted to the tale an interest and a significance which are not to be found in the original. In his hands it becomes one of the most charming love-stories that ever was written. The coarseness of Boccaccio's pictures is eliminated; and the universal passion is traced, through all its phases and developments, with wonderful minuteness and truth. In Troylus it assumes its noblest, most delicate, and most chivalrous form. Pandarus represents its vulgarest ideas; while Cryseyde is a fascinating woman of the world, who loves indeed, and sincerely for the time, but has not depth and strength of character sufficient to resist the effects of absence and new associations.

The following passage is characteristic of Chaucer's manner of taking his illustrations from the commonest things. Troylus, like Benedict, has hitherto despised love; but is suddenly captivated by Cryseyde, whom he sees in the Temple of Pallas.

'As proude Bayard¹ 'ginneth for to skip
Out of the way, so pricketh him² his corn,
Till he a lash have of the longe whip,
Then thinketh he, Though I go all befor
First in the trace, full fat and new yshorn,
Yet am I but an horse, and horse's law
I must endure, and as my ferres³ draw.

'So fared it by that fierce and proude knight,
Though he a worthy Kinges sonnè were;;
He wenèd nothing had had suchè might
Against his will that should his heartè stir;
Yet with a look his heartè waxed on fire
That he that now was most in pride above,
Was suddenly most servant unto love.'

The nightingale has always been a favourite with poets; but we question whether she ever inspired a more beautiful simile than this. It is more true to nature in every respect than Virgil's celebrated one, beginning *Qualis populeâ*, in the fourth Georgic:—

'And as the new abashed nightingale,
That stinteth⁴ first when she beginneth sing,
When that she heareth any herdès tale,
Or in the hedges any wight stirring;
And, after, sicker⁵ doth⁶ her voice outring;
Right so Cryseydè when her dreadè stint,⁷
Opened her heart, and told him her intent.'

¹ A name for a bay horse.

² With more confidence.

³ Incites.

⁴ Causes.

⁵ Fellows.

⁶ Ceased.

⁷ Ceases.

The close of the poem is curiously illustrative of 'the religious spirit of the age:—

' O youngè freshè folkes, he or she,
In which that love upgroweth with your age,
Repaireth home from worldly vanity,
And of your heart upcasteth the visage
To thilike¹ God that after his imàge
You made, and thinketh² all n'is but a fair,
This world that passeth soon as flowers fare.

' And loveth Him the which that, right for love,
Upon a cross, our soulès for to buy,
First starf,³ and rose, and sits in heaven above,
For He n'll falsen no wight, dare I say,
That will his heart all wholly on Him lay;
And since He best to love is, and most meek,
What needeth feigned lovès for to seek ?

The translation of the 'Roman de la Rose,' and the 'Troilus and Cryseyde' were so displeasing to the ladies of the Court, that the Queen insisted that Chaucer should make satisfaction to the injured sex; which he did by writing *The Legende of Good Women*, or 'The Saints' Legend of Cupid,' that is, 'The Legend of the Saints of Cupid.' It consists of the stories of Dido, Cleopatra, and other celebrated women of antiquity who died for love. This is the first of Chaucer's poems which is written in the heroic measure. It is taken chiefly from Virgil and Ovid's *Heroides*, and the prologue especially contains many striking passages; but our limited space will not permit us to extract them.

Whatever may be the merit of the poems which we have already noticed, it is upon the 'Canterbury Tales' that Chaucer's fame is mainly founded. They are the offspring of his genius matured by incessant labour—for besides the voluminous works which have come down to us from his pen, he wrote many more which are now lost—and enriched by a thorough knowledge of the contemporary literature of France and Italy. Some minds are cowed and cramped by the study of the masterpieces of genius, and driven to despair of their own powers of competing with them: increasing knowledge of what others had done before him only indicated to Chaucer the true sources of poetic inspiration, and taught him to rely upon his powers of improving upon ideas which had been imperfectly developed by their inventors. There can be little doubt that the 'Decameron' suggested the plan of the 'Canterbury Tales;' but how differently it is treated by the two poets! Boccaccio's

¹ That.

³ Died. German, *sterben*.

² Think ye; imperative mood, second person plur.

description of the plague is, indeed, unrivalled in its grandeur and simplicity; his glowing pictures of the villa and the gardens near Florence, and of the gay and thoughtless company who took refuge in them from the scourge which was devastating their country, are full of the sunny voluptuousness of an Italian sky. But his characters, being all drawn from the higher classes of society, want individuality; and there is something indescribably revolting in the close proximity of death, in its most ghastly form, with the thoughtless licentiousness of the gay cavaliers and *spirituelle* ladies, who are resolved to drown all thoughts of the calamities of their friends, and of their own danger, in the enjoyment of a refined but profligate epicureanism. The tales they relate are, indeed, admirable in their way; but their merit consists in their brevity and succinctness; the weight of the interest is thrown entirely on the incidents, and there is no place left for the delineation of character or manners. Chaucer's plan, on the contrary, is perfectly natural, and presents no incongruity. It possesses the variety and individuality which always exist in nature, and which are attained in art by adhering strictly to her guidance. A mere copyist of Boccaccio would have gathered together a company of ladies and gentlemen on some pretext or other, and set them to tell stories with as little discrimination of fitness as is displayed in the 'Decameron.' Or he might have adopted some such cumbersome vehicle for his tales as Gower employed in his 'Confessio Amantis.' But Chaucer adds to the original idea another of much greater value; he determines to bring all classes of his countrymen together, and to put into the mouth of each a tale which should be characteristic of his rank and profession. For such an assemblage he has not far to seek; the Kentish road supplies him with motley crowds of men and women of every grade and variety of character, hastening to perform the pilgrimage which they had vowed in sickness or distress to the most popular shrine in England. Here the contests which agitated the several orders of society find their counterpart; the rival tradesmen tell tales for the purpose of bringing the crafts of their adversaries into contempt; the jealousy which divided the secular and regular clergy, and convulsed the Church, is illustrated in the amusing squabble between the Sompnour and the Frere; the poet contrives to overwhelm with ridicule the extravagances of the popular romance by reciting one which calls forth the indignant reprobation of the company, and the jolly host of the 'Tabard' begs of him pathetically to cease his 'rhyme doggerel,' which is sending them all to sleep for very weariness. One of the lower personages, of course, gets drunk, falls off his horse, and quarrels with his neighbour; and the

whole is enlivened by a running commentary, in the shape of a dialogue, in which the host gives his opinion freely of the persons and their tales. In short, all the ordinary incidents of a journey with a mixed company of English travellers, are thrown on the canvas with a breadth, a vigour, and a truthfulness which make this great poem no less admirable as a work of art than as a picture of manners.

The tales themselves are chosen with no less judgment than is displayed in the framework which connects them together. They represent the several species of composition which were then popular, polished and improved by the genius and art of a great poet. The shelves of the libraries of castles and monasteries groaned under the weight of romances of chivalry; the *Knight's Tale* is an example of what such a story should be. Humorous and not very delicate *fabliaux* were repeated at the fireside in the hall and grange on winter evenings, while the lady and her maids were spinning, and the master was roasting crabs in the fire for his evening tankard; the miller, the reeve, the nun's priest, and the merchant relate *fabliaux*, which must have cast all these evening exercises into the shade. The tales of the two nuns are specimens of the 'miracles' which used 'to stir men to devotion,' and the Pardoner relates one of the moral apologues which were often introduced into sermons to arrest the attention of a sleepy or ignorant congregation. The *Wife of Bath's* prologue and the tale of *Melibeus* represent those moral disquisitions described by Erasmus, with which the wandering minstrel used to vary his stock of ballads and romances; the *Squire's Tale* represents the popular stories of natural magic; the *Franklin* and the *Clerk of Oxenford* raise those nice questions in the casuistry of love which the Courts of Love delighted to discuss; and, finally, the parson's disquisition upon the seven deadly sins and their remedies, is Chaucer's idea of what a sermon ought to be. He evidently felt himself, in his character of poet, to be a teacher; and with a view to elevate the taste of his countrymen, he took up the several species of literary composition current among the people, and raised them to the highest perfection of which they were susceptible.

We have already given a few extracts from the 'Canterbury Tales,' for the purpose of illustrating the student-life of the period; space would fail us to enter further into the merits, or to give the reader any idea of the character of this great poem. We can only refer him to the original, which is now, for the first time, made accessible to all readers in Mr. Bell's elegant and scholarlike edition. The 'Canterbury Tales,' in all probability, occupied the latter part of the poet's life, and were circulated as they were produced. Some of them were certainly,

as Tyrwhitt shows, written subsequently to the year 1386, and were in all probability left unfinished and in confusion at the poet's death.

The variety of Chaucer's pursuits and attainments is no less surprising than his excellence as a poet. It is true, the arts are all akin to one another; but it is not often that a poet is also an architect and astronomer. In 1389 Chaucer was appointed Clerk of the Works to the King; and from documents preserved in the Record Office, it appears that he was engaged in the repair of S. George's Chapel at Windsor. His name is thus connected with one of the best architectural monuments of his time. But he appears not to have held this appointment long. In 1391, as we must believe, though Mr. Bell thinks the evidence unsatisfactory, he wrote a work in English on the use of the Astrolabe, an instrument for making astronomical observations, and addressed it to 'little Louis, my son,' in a preface which reminds us strongly of Scott's pretty dedication of his 'Tales of a Grandfather' to Hugh Lockhart.

Misfortune was now pressing heavily upon him; he forestals his pension; borrows trifling sums of money; and in 1394 the King grants him a small pension of 10*l.* per annum; but this is not enough. In 1398 his Majesty still further befriends him by giving him letters of protection from arrest; but he appears to be still obliged to anticipate his means, till the accession of Henry the Fourth, the son of his old patron, throws a gleam of sunshine over his declining days. In 1399 the new monarch assigned him a pension of 36*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.*,—a large sum in those days; and the poet took a lease from the Abbot of Westminster of a house 'in the garden of the blessed Mary of Westminster,' which we should suppose meant Covent Garden, but which Mr. Bell supposes to have been on the site of King Henry the Seventh's Chapel. Here he died on the 25th of October, 1400, and was buried in the Abbey, where his tomb is still to be seen.

Of his two sons, Louis, to whom he dedicated his astronomical treatise, is supposed to have died young, for nothing more is heard of him; but Thomas, who was himself a poet, married Matilda, a daughter of Sir John Burghersh, and became a person of great wealth and importance. His only child, Alice, was united in a third marriage with William de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk. John de la Pole, her eldest son by this marriage, married the Princess Elizabeth Plantagenet, sister of King Edward the Fourth; and their eldest son, John de la Pole, was declared by Richard the Third heir-apparent to the throne, in case the Prince of Wales should die without issue. Thus the poet Chaucer narrowly escaped being the great-great-grandfather of a King of England.

Before closing our paper, we must warn our readers against judging of Chaucer from Dryden's and Pope's translations. They are as unlike to the original as Lord Cardigan is to the Chevalier Bayard, or the present Primate to S. Thomas à Becket. Many persons are prejudiced against 'the father of English poetry,' by a disgusting poem which Pope had the assurance to write as an imitation of his manner; but neither the language, the subject, nor the mode of treating it, bear the smallest resemblance to anything of Chaucer's which has come down to us. Chaucer, indeed, occasionally borrowed a coarse *fabliau* from the lower orders; but he so enveloped it in wit, humour, and picturesque description, that the coarseness is almost forgotten, and becomes innocuous.

- ART. III.—1. *History of the Jewish Nation after the Destruction of Jerusalem under Titus.* By the Rev. ALFRED EDERSHEIM, Ph. D., Old Aberdeen.
2. *Post-biblical History of the Jews.* By MORRIS J. RAPHAEL, M.A., Ph. D. In two vols.
3. *Library of Biblical Literature.* London: William Freeman, 69, Fleet Street.

THE history of the Jews, as one among the nations of Western Asia, has no political lessons to teach of which the world is likely to stand in need. Their whole national record is one of an exceptional and isolated character. The Syro-Greek empire contained nothing like them; and even the Roman, within whose experience political analogies were more fully developed than throughout all the rest of the ancient world, found and left the Jews distinct and unassimilating. Egypt and her priesthood, iron-bound in the fetters of caste, gave way, in the last few centuries B. C., before the dangerous fascinations of Greek commerce, Greek science and art, Greek sects and schools. But in spite of every seducing flattery and persecuting stratagem, addressed in turn to the Jews by the rival monarchies of Syria and Egypt, the spirit of the nation retained its individuality. High-priests and magnates of the race might Græcize or apostatize, but the people on the whole stood fast, and remained amidst the vortex of distracting parties, without resources, or leaders, or any single united plan of action, in the face of the greatest power of the world, true still to the name and distinctive habits and feelings of the house of Israel.

Regarded therefore as a race, ineradicably tenacious of a highly-featured individuality, there is no people on the face of the earth whose history is so full of interest, and whose eventful annals are so deeply scored with appeals to our sympathy. The principal characteristics of those annals are ruthless oppression and resolute independence, the counter-friction of which at last ground them as a nation to fragments, and left them to be pulverized and scattered beneath the four winds of heaven; yet still, like the diamond dust, they remain indestructible, and exercise a friction upon every surface with which they are brought in contact. There is, indeed, no race of men whose fortunes history—that is, Providence on its human side—keeps so continually in view. With a degree of early civilization which, at any rate in Solomon's period, surpassed that of probably all, not even excepting the Egyptians, the nations who surrounded them, they kept

aloof from all, doomed to 'dwell alone,' and 'not be reckoned amongst the nations.' The civilization of the Western nations gradually arose, surpassed, and even encompassed, but did not overflow their boundaries, and but scantily mixed with theirs. The first plunge from the densely-peopled hive of ancient Egypt into the severe and hardening solitude of the wilderness seems to have set their character—to have moulded the outward form and settled the inward grain. It was the probation of extremes—the alternate ordeal of the furnace heat and the freezing point—which sent them forth, first to conquer, and then to endure for evermore. Yet the great interest with which we regard them arises from the fact that they were the reservoir of spirituality from which, as regards human *media*, the world was to draw its knowledge of that truth which is the sublimest point within reach of human faculties. The plant of Israel was to preserve it, to scatter the seed, and to be left the husk—not, however, without all remnant of vitality; but to become, in fulness of time, the last bud on the bough of promise, even as they were the first. As regards present facts, however, they are marked by an effete-ness of spirituality, which forms the greatest possible contrast with their former monopoly of law and promises. They were, amid the waste of the olden world, the sole depository of that faith, of which they seem barren and vacant now that its legitimate province has grown to be the world at large; and fulfil the type of the fleece, dewy when all around was dry, and then dry when all around was dewy. It is gratifying to find an increase of literary attention paid to the history of the Jews. The works the names of which are prefixed to this article, are the most recent specimens with which the publishers' list furnishes us. The author of the first is a Doctor of Philosophy in Old Aberdeen, and his name, Edersheim, seems to point to German extraction. The author of the second is by name and office evidently a Jew. He combines with the same title of Doctor of Philosophy, that of Rabbi-preacher at a synagogue in New York. The object of the former appears to have been to give, in a series of rather loosely-connected essays, his views on all points of interest in the development or decline of the Jews as a nation and a race; that of the latter, to write in chronological form and sequence their 'post-biblical history,' and in a manner likely most favourably to impress the transatlantic branch of the Anglo-Saxon race. Two volumes of his history are alone at present before the world, with no expressed intention, although with a possibility open, of a sequel. In these he embraces the period from the close of the Old Testament to the destruction of the second Temple, A. D. 70. The two books differ largely

in their scope and execution. Both alike labour under a great defect in any work of history—the want of indexes and maps. Of the latter, Dr. Edersheim has one only, the other author none at all. The main point of diversity is, however, that the Rabbi skips Christianity. ‘We,’ he says, meaning probably himself individually, ‘do not feel called upon to enter into this subject;’ for, at its origin, and during its infancy, Christianity has no ‘claim on the attention of the Jewish historian.’ He is, accordingly, content to indicate ‘the administration of Pontius Pilate,’ as that during which ‘the events related in the historical books of the Christian Scriptures are said to have occurred.’ Yet he cites not unfrequently passages from those Scriptures as authorities for minor points of fact; whilst his phraseology recalls not unfrequently the world-wide words of the author of Christianity woven into the texture of the Anglo-Saxon tongue: thus the Asmonæan prince Jannai (Alexander Jannæus) is said to have been ‘summoned to render *‘an account of his stewardship,’* i. e. to have died, while meditating the siege of a trans-Jordanic stronghold; and although the phrase to ‘strain at a gnat and swallow a camel’ (vol. i. p. 138), was perhaps of rabbinical origin, yet its adoption in this corrupted form¹ from our authorised version shows that, although our author ignores Christianity, he does not forget that he is writing for a public chiefly Christian at least by profession. Surely it would have been directly in the path of a Jewish writer, who writes with the New Testament before him, to examine the claim which it advances to contain a prophecy of that awful woe which forms the catastrophe of his story. It would not have been remote from his legitimate province to sift the statements that, in that very siege, owing to their credence of that alleged prophecy, not a Christian perished; and to have considered generally, if only on political grounds, the effect which the eager propagation of Christianity in Judæa, during more than a generation, may have had in dividing the counsels, distracting the allegiance, and impoverishing the resources of the Jewish nationality in its struggle for existence.

Thus the mode of death which befel the first Herod is recorded because, it should seem, Herod was chiefly known as a persecutor of the Jews, and his frightful sufferings seem to mark a judicial vindication of the chosen race. The question of whether the Sanhedrin at the Christian era retained the power of capital punishment is briefly decided in the negative, with

¹ It is hardly necessary to refer to the Greek *διωλκόμενος*, as showing that ‘to strain at’ is a rendering in which the original idea, that of straining liquor, is lost. Perhaps it is a mere misprint in the original version for ‘strain out.’

the further statement, marked by Dr. Edersheim as dubious, that they 'voluntarily renounced it'; the Talmud being appealed to as a final authority, and an allusion made to John xviii. 31. The case of S. Stephen, and the question whether the execution dealt on him was judicial or tumultuary, is carefully avoided, though directly in point, and for obvious reasons. The author has told us that 'it is not until the day of its power,' that 'Christianity enforces its painful claim on the reluctant' notice of him who relates the tear-bedewed and blood-stained 'events of the Jewish history.' That is to say, when the Christians begin to persecute the Jews, it is the Jewish historian's business to mention the fact; but while the Jews only persecute the Christians, it is his business to suppress it. Thus with a series of authorities before him, partly if not wholly contemporaneous and independent—that is to say, the four Gospels and the Acts, together with the mass of illustration derivable from the Apostolic Epistles—he shrinks from contact with them save at a few carefully-guarded points; and passing over these first-rate sources of information, fastens on the pages of Josephus, whom he himself repeatedly disparages, and on those of different heathen writers, valuable mainly in confirmation only, and remote by their position or their period from all sympathy with the facts. It is only too obvious why a Rabbi should pursue this course; his reasons for it are clearly coincident, and his plan consistent, with those of Josephus, whom he censures.

But Josephus is ingenuity and sincerity itself as compared with his modern successor in Jewish history, who leaves, in the latter part of his narrative, chasms which confound the order and relation of events, solely, as it seems to us, to avoid dwelling on facts, which, if mentioned with the most passing touch, would give its true native prominence to Christianity. Thus, the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas in Galilee, his wars with Aretas the Arab, and his ambitious intrigues for extended dominion through envy of Agrippa, are dropped from the history of the Jews. That is to say, we *do* find *the name* of that tetrarch twice occurring¹ within eight pages; but the intervening space is devoted to the deeds of the Judean procurators sent by Rome; and the mention each time contains a bare notice of Galilee as in a state of tumult; but not a word of detail is bestowed, lest it should convey a hint, or seem to avoid one, of that vaster than human agency which was stirring there, and of Him who retired for a while lest 'the people should take Him by force and make Him a king.' In a word, the history of Galilee and its tetrarch

¹ Raphall, vol. ii. p. 365, 373.

during this period is left a blank; we hope that the party-coloured Christianity of the West, for whose benefit the author writes, will appreciate the reason why. To the readers of Josephus,—marked as is the aposiopsis with which he stops short of many interesting facts, of which he must have felt the force, as he ‘passed by on the other side,’—the length at which he dwells on the mission and adventures of S. John the Baptist form one of the most striking of his episodes. And, indeed, when we consider that that preacher was the son of a priest, and led the rare life of a Nazarite; that the chiefs of the nation sent from the capital a deputation of Priests and Levites to inquire into his prophetic pretensions, and that he stirred popular feeling far and wide by the vigour of his appeal to the light within themselves; that he was seized, imprisoned, and beheaded, by the ruler of his country, through an intrigue of the palace—we feel that no Jewish historian can omit such facts and be true to his assumed office. Yet Dr. Raphall passes the whole by in silence;—one would never from his pages gather that there had lived such a person as John the son of Zachariah, or that the sins of royalty against the law of the country were confronted by the bold champion of purity. In order to avoid mention of the Baptist, the incest with Herodias is omitted; and in order to avoid mention of the incest with Herodias, the whole Arabian war of Antipas, to which it led, is suppressed. The fact that Agrippa I. received ‘the tetrarchies’ from Caius Cæsar before the kingdom of Judæa became his, is just intimated (*ibid.* p. 384); but why is no word added to account for his succeeding to a living man? Why no hint of the fact that the tetrarch Antipas, whose wife Herodias was piqued at his eclipse by Agrippa, was by her instigated to become a suitor with the same Cæsar for royalty, that he failed through the counter-machinations of Agrippa, and not only failed in what he aspired to, but lost what he then had—the tetrarchy of Galilee, which Cæsar, provoked by his assurance, then gave to Agrippa as sovereign, whilst he banished Antipas to a remote province? Why, in short, are the sixth and eighth chapters of the eighteenth book of the ‘Jewish Antiquities’ avoided as if tainted with spuriousness, whilst the seventh is carefully searched for all its leading facts to ornament the career of Agrippa? It is only too plain, that to mention Antipas’ exile would have forced a mention of Herodias, and *that* would have had associations from which the author shrank.

Again, and even more indignantly, we demand why is the death of king Agrippa (Acts xii. 21–23), after a far longer dwelling on his really adventurous life than its importance required, slurred over with the following inuendo of a falsehood,—

• He did not long *survive this disappointment* (that of having the fortification of Jerusalem checked by an imperial veto), but 'died at Cæsarea after having reigned, &c.' (Ibid. p. 384)? Why not a word of the scene of his appearance in the amphitheatre, of the owl on the rope, of the people's adulation and his conscience-stricken rejoinder, which Josephus so carefully works up, unconscious, it would seem, of the existence of S. Luke's second work? Evidently because the careful Rabbi had read the Christian Scripture, and would rather cut out of his narrative the most interesting of all the extant facts which relate to a prominent personage, than violate his own proclaimed silence in regard to the events of rising Christianity. He had rather ignore Josephus, than allow a confirmation of S. Luke by that writer. And thus to the *suppressio veri* he superadds the *suggestio falsi*, in connecting his death with his supposed 'disappointment,' of which Josephus says not a single word, and the insinuation of which, as a cause of his death, is totally foreign to the *insouciant* cast of his character. After this, it is almost superfluous to notice that, when speaking of this king's sincere attachment to his religion, it would have been opportune to mention how one passover he sacrificed to this popular zeal an obscure ringleader of a rising sect, and imprisoned another (Acts xii. 1—3); but our Rabbi wisely abstains from violating his candid pledge to keep Christianity in the background. It would not suit his book to show any martyrdoms which do not bespeak his readers' sympathies for the cause of which he is the historical advocate.

After such evasion of first-rate authorities on cardinal points, it is idle to quote them on unimportant details; to adduce S. Matthew on the massacre of the innocents, and S. Luke on Pilate's slaughter of the Galilæans. Nor do we see what is gained for Jewish principles by an author's refusing to follow the conventional A. D. for the Christian era, and yet speaking of 'the New Testament.'

The blemishes in detail are innumerable; and besides showing considerable ignorance, embrace a copious variety of the faults of rash writing. Firstly, of the classical qualifications of a man who professes to cite, every few pages, original Greek and Latin authorities, we are sorry to speak in terms which forbid our supposing him able to construe a page of them. By what licence, except that of ignorance, he writes *sicarri* for *sicarii*, *jus gladii* for *jus gladii*, and considers *Sebaste* the Greek equivalent for Augustus, we cannot conceive.¹ Here is his

¹ So we have (vol. ii. p. 67) 'the fixing of the *Neominae*,' which probably means the fixing the day of the new moon; though how that name is derivable from the legitimate Greek orthography (*νεμυνηα*), it is not easy to see.

comment on the name Pontius Pilatus:—‘Some,’ we are told, ‘derive his origin from Pontus, the kingdom of the great Mithridates, whence his name Pontius;’ (which we rather think Livy mentions as an old Samnite name before Mithridates was born or thought of;) ‘his surname, *Pilatus*, was probably derived ‘from his skill in throwing the spear, *pilum*, or *pila*.’” Would he derive *Torquatus* from skill in twisting collars, and *Barbatus* from dexterity in shaving? Then there is a note (vol. ii. p. 428-9) which seeks to illustrate the fate of Jotapata, where ‘twelve hundred captives were spared’ and ‘forty thousand slaughtered,’ by that of a Belgic town taken by Julius Cæsar, whose ‘alleged treachery so exasperated Cæsar, that having ‘assaulted and taken the place, he ordered all that resisted to ‘be cut down, and the captives to be sold as slaves.’ On turning to the passage in the Commentaries (De B. G. ii. 33), we find that the ‘exasperation’ of Cæsar is Dr. Raphall’s own discovery; that none were cut down or ordered by Cæsar to be cut down after the capture; that on the final assault no resistance was made; that the affair was in this stage bloodless, though the place had suffered severely the day before, in a *sortie* made in violation of terms accepted; and that all who were found at the final assault were sold as slaves; in every one of which particulars we find the illustration fails. He probably misunderstood the phrase of the original, if he ever indeed looked at it, *sectionem ejus oppidi universam Cæsar vendidit*. This is a most unlucky attempt to force a little needless scholarship into a note. But to take him on his own ground, there is a curious inconsistency in his first adopting (vol. ii. p. 197) the authority of Dion Cassius, who, differing from Josephus, makes Aristobulus at once, on his first interview with Pompey, be detained as a prisoner in the Roman camp, and then departing from that authority, where a few pages further on he speaks of the same Aristobulus, prisoner but just before, ‘from the lofty summit of ‘the temple mount’ viewing ‘the vast extent of the Roman ‘host, and their formidable preparations.’ He also (vol. i. p. 338) evidently takes Scythopolis to be still a Scythian colony, in the heart of Judæa, at the Maccabean era. His parallel between the battle of Azotus and Waterloo is a flight of fancy which might provoke mirth amidst the gravest criticism. To demolish the illustration, we have only to say, that the author’s own view of the tactic of Azotus is that it was that of a phalanx attacked on two of its faces at once; this is probably correct, but destructive of the parallel; nor is the matter mended by the further statement that, ‘like Appollonius (the Syrian general),

¹ Which reminds us of the genealogy supplied in the ‘Golden Legend,’ or ‘*Vitas Patrum*,’ we forget which.—‘His father’s name was *Pil*, and his mother’s *At*.’

Napoleon *chiefly* relied on his cavalry for the victory;’ which, though it help the parallel, is incorrect. ‘We cannot,’ he concludes, ‘help smiling as we ask ourselves what share of the ‘glory of Wellington, and the subsequent fortunes of Europe, ‘may be due to the generalship of Jonathan the Maccabee?’ We, too, ‘cannot help smiling.’

We have only room for one more—a calculating—blunder; he takes the datum of 30,000 men as the number of Judæans whom king Demetrius offered (vol. i. p. 362) to enlist in his service; and reasons from it by the light of modern statistics, according to which ‘it would give us for Judæa alone, ‘exclusive of Samaria, Idumæa, &c., a population of nearly ‘three millions.’ Of course it would; but who supposes that Syrian monarchs limited their demands to the military margin allowed by modern political economists? The atrocious squandering of their brilliant resources by these very sovereigns, is one of the most woful studies of premature decline which history offers. As well might one apply such a basis of calculation to the Jewish war, in the course of which Josephus speaks in one place of half the entire male adult population of Galilee as being enrolled to serve.

This book, moreover, has a sad twang of the bustling clap-traps of republicanism, which, it seems, no book written by an American citizen, and meant to be popular, can escape. We are sorry to find that even a Jew is no exception to this; and that the oldest nation of mankind can thus fawn upon the prejudices of the youngest. ‘Though no prophet had arisen, yet ‘the voice of the people, which in Israel had always been considered as the *vox Dei*, the voice of God, had decided that’ Hyrcanus was not to be king and priest too. The point of the question before the writer here so irresistibly suggests the case of Saul, and the exercise of the *vox populi* in his instance, that to identify it with the *vox Dei* becomes a sort of blasphemy by implication. In a similar strain the Maccabees are proclaimed as the maintainers of religious liberty, champions of freedom of conscience, &c. Did it ever occur to Dr. Raphall to consider how Judas the Maccabee would probably have dealt with the case of an Israelite embracing the Stoic or Epicurean philosophy, and abandoning circumcision as repugnant to an ‘enlightened’ mind? We are sorry also to observe a carelessness in adopting the grossly-exaggerated statements which cloud Jewish history, especially Maccabean and Talmudic, wherever the question is one of numbers. He remarks in a note—‘The judicious reader may perhaps here, and on other occasions’—(the present is one of a statement of 30,000 men having been lost ‘in a running fight,’)—‘suspect the numbers; but in the Books of

'Maccabees they are given in words at length, not in letters, 'the usual numeral signs of the Greeks; and "*famæ verum standum est*,"' as Livy says.' Has Dr. Raphall then had access to the original MSS. of the books compiled by Jason of Cyrene? If not, of what value is the assertion regarding the absence of literal numeration?

The blemishes of style which strike us in the perusal of these volumes are perhaps scarcely felt on the American side of the Atlantic. To speak of a Roman emperor as the 'old crony' of a Judæan king, and to deplore the frequency with which the questionable chronology of Manetho has been 'again and again hashed up,' to serve prejudices, is perhaps elegant English in New England, and we should not expect severe rules of writing among purely free institutions, where probably one word is as good as another. It is, however, but fair to allow that the uniform buoyancy of the style, though it rises at times into that loose enthusiasm of the advocate, which imperils the veracity of the historian, has the effect of bearing off unperceived these surface-blemishes—at any rate, to the popular reader for whom he writes. 'We write,' he says, 'for the people; and the 'better to reach them, we will endeavour to amuse as well as 'to instruct them. Interesting narrations, a popular style, and 'respect for the belief and feelings of our readers, is what such 'a publication requires; and in these essentials we trust we shall 'not be found wanting.' We are bound to admit that the complaisant Rabbi has satisfied his own standard fairly enough, but to that standard we have shown grave reasons for demurring. Nor is it wholly uninteresting to watch the way in which Judaism catches the tone of the land and people of its sojourn; from the Neo-Platonism of Alexandria eighteen centuries ago, to the Neo-Franklinism of New York in our own day. Of course, we might expect the customary laudation of Washington, without which no author, especially of Jewish descent, could vindicate the genuineness of Western citizenship.

The less cursory reader will, however, turn the well-loaded pages of Dr. Edersheim with more confidence and satisfaction, though with some degree of hesitation and perplexity, owing to the want of organization which pervades their abundant matter. His one map appears, though small, yet clear; and Palestine Proper is a country so concise, that it may be mapped with some effect on the scale of a small octavo page. It gives the main lines of communication between great points, and corrects a

¹ The diphthong of *famæ* is printed with *o*. This might be an error of the press; but the apparent ignorance that *verum* is a conjunction, and its awkward misfit with 'and' just before, makes one hesitate to accept it in this light.

popular error, that Samaria extended to the sea-coast. Beginning his province of the subject where that of the Rabbi closes, he compresses into about twenty closely-written pages of preliminary sketch, the actual history of the period which fills up the two volumes of Dr. Raphall. This sketch of a period so fertile, in many of its parts, in that intrigue which so entangles the task of the historian, is as well executed as the difficulties of such a performance perhaps admit; but under the stricture of such enforced compression, we must be allowed to say that it does not seem worth while to deliver even the outlines of history. The *multum in parvo* style in narrative is never the *bonum*. It would be superfluous now to give the reasons for this opinion; and we must be content with saying that if these twenty pages of preliminary sketch had been extended to a hundred, or even to fifty, the work might have been considerably improved. We say *might* have been, for there is after all some doubt whether Dr. Edersheim possesses some of the primary qualifications for an historian; and we even hesitate to allow that his book fulfils its title as a '*history* of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus,' whatever value we may attach to the copious sources of historical illustration and information which it opens. It is true there is a want of accuracy here and there; thus, p. 11, he says that, 'the high-priest, Simon the Just, was succeeded by Eleazar, and the latter by Onias II. (about 250 B. C.);' but what has become of the high-priest Manasseh, who, according to Prideaux (chronological table, vol. ii.), succeeded Eleazar, and held office from 276 to 250 B. C., and was then succeeded by Onias II.? So again, p. 115, 'one of the most celebrated of the "men of the great synagogue" was the high-priest Simon the Just (221—201 B. C.);' but Prideaux (*Ibid.* vol. i.) gives 300—292 B. C., as the term of Simon's high-priesthood. Further, this same Simon is, by Prideaux, on the authority of 'Maimonides, and the rest of the Rabbins' (vol. i. p. 632 and note), said to have been *the last* of those 'men of the great synagogue;' now Dr. Edersheim (p. 113) makes the period of their administration extend 'from about 532 to 167 B. C.,' both of which are dates assigned in defiance of all possible chronology; for 532 B. C. is only four years after the first decree of Cyrus for the restoration of the Temple; and Ezra, in whom the 'great synagogue' is commonly reckoned to have begun, did not, according to Prideaux and Ueber, come to Judæa until 458 B. C. Again, the year 167 B. C. certainly plunges us into the midst of the persecutions of Epiphanes, and brings us to the period of the prevalence of apostasy under the high-priestly traitors, Jason and Menelaus, and is therefore far

too late for even the close of the honoured list of the fathers of the later Jewish Church. Thus from 532 to 167 B. C. embraces a period which commences about seventy years too early, and ends about thirty years too late.

As might be expected, a slight tinge of the Puritanic and Presbyterian leaven is diffused in a book written by a North Briton, in which the analogies of the Christian Church, on such points as Scripture, tradition, and ecclesiastical government, come in as possible illustrations of Jewish views on the same particulars. We may mention pp. 146, 403, 408, of Dr. Ederheim's volume, as examples of our meaning. At the same time, we are bound to acknowledge a remarkable forbearance in general on such points. The chapter on the last war of independence, under Bar-Cochab, is the redeeming portion of the volume. The facts therein contained are probably new to a majority of educated readers; and although the struggle which it details was hardly more than the convulsive throes which marks the passage of the vital spark from the mortally wounded frame, yet the interest of the whole Jewish tragedy, especially as viewed in its Messianic relations, will be felt without this last act to be incomplete. We have next interposed a series of chapters on different highly-interesting points of Jewish antiquity, on the efforts in compiling which the author seems mainly to rest his claim to our regard; and, after the 'social condition,' the 'arts and sciences,' and lastly, the 'theology and religious belief' of the Jews, have been minutely and copiously treated, the course of history is resumed in the Jewish 'patriarchate under the last pagan emperors.' If the seventh chapter on Bar-Chocab be the fullest of interest, those which follow it on these points of Hebrew antiquity, however they may encumber the narrative, will perhaps be found the most valuable to the student. Yet we could here too wish for something which we do not find, and which we think the author could give; some clue, viz., to the various editions and translations, if any, of the Mishna and the Talmuds, to which he so frequently refers. This would have been a proper tribute to that craving for real authorities and ultimate sources of information which honourably marks the students of our age. These mountains of tradition, containing the mental *detritus* of many ages of men, and which had hardly more than pushed up their first ridges when the Son of God and Man denounced their tendency to supersede Divine by human teaching, contain here and there, amidst their hoarded refuse, a pearl of great price. Schools, and families of schools, of interpretation, up to the extinct organization, if we so may phrase it, of an earlier world of thought, may here be traced in their remains. Another great defect, and one which

impairs the value of the result, with which Dr. Edersheim presents us, is the absence of periodic distinction in the antiquities which he amasses. We are at liberty to assume, that any given usage of which he may speak is referable to the fourth century A.D. or B.C., and the effect on the student's judgment is like that of a drawing without perspective on the eye. For instance, opening the book in these antiquarian chapters at random, we find on p. 308 a description of the writing materials in common use; but here, with the exception of the one rather vague statement—'the art of writing seems to have been extensively known in Palestine, even during the reign of David,'—there is no attempt to mark any epochs in the development of an usage which so largely measures by its comparative diffusion and perfection the civilization of a people. So, again, the *sortes* taken similarly on p. 358 yield some remarks on metres, the 'forms' of which, we are told, 'gradually developed;' where some hints marking the development in periods, which might probably have been collected from a comparison of earlier and later Psalms, would have been acceptable and appropriate. In concluding our remarks on Dr. Edersheim, we may notice, that to illustrate the division of law (p. 385), into 'statutory or written, and customary or unwritten, by the analogy of Scottish law,' seems to imply a limited acquaintance with an universal ancient form of jurisprudential science.

The third and last publication on our list is one which appeals probably to a lower class of readers than those whom we can venture to designate as either learned or educated; it is a series of twopenny tracts, constituting a so-called 'library of biblical literature,' and is not wholly above the errors and prejudices of the class to which it is addressed. It will, however, probably feed and stimulate an attention to many facts of Jewish history, with their cognate questions, which we are glad should exist and increase; and if it succeeds in this, it will be far from an useless book.

After all, and viewed even in the light of a purely human theory, there is no set of writings, which, as an authority on all points connected with the life of Judaism, can compare with those which form the New Testament. Setting inspiration for the moment apart, where in the history of the world, ancient or modern, have we such a thoroughly popular literature of any period as in them? The homely simplicity, true to their popular origin, which pervades them, matchless in its freedom from all the artificial resources of the synagogue or of the schools, carries on the very surface of their text a most powerful appeal to all the most genuine feelings of humanity. And, even admitting that the Epistles of S. Paul show traces of the whilom Pharisee

and skilled dialectician, this is more than compensated by the fact, that almost every thought which issues from his pen in argument bears with it the bold and absolute renunciation of his former prejudices. It is the impossibility, through his position and opinions, of appreciating the claims of the New Testament as an historical authority, which starves the later chapters of the animated and interesting work of the Rabbi of the New York synagogue. It is, however, most desirable for Christian students to throw on the study of their own peculiar, as distinct from the Jewish, Scriptures, a light gathered from a full comprehension of the several influences which had fluctuated through the great Jewish family during their latter centuries of doubtful independence. It is worth while to obtain the most intimate view, and to form the most accurate estimate possible, of the outward features and inward spirit of that great dispersed society and world-wide race. We have already noticed the influence which the sojourn in Egypt and the desert had upon the first stage of their history. That is concluded by the captivity, where the second begins, to close in the desolation of the Holy City by the legions of Titus. The work of Dr. Edersheim is valuable, so far as it has any strictly historical worth, in supplying the connexion between this second and the third period, which, as far as we can see, has no end, save that yet future one pointed to by the consummation of prophecy. On that final issue it is not our purpose to speculate at present. So far as it is yet unravelled, the interest of their temporal as well as spiritual history culminates in the second period; and this we suppose that even a Jew would admit. We proceed, then, to assemble a few considerations which may clear up the picture of those eventful days, within which falls the human history of the glorified Redeemer, rejected by the Jews, but embraced by the elect amongst mankind.

The two captivities of Israel and Judah are too often viewed as though they were identical in process and immediate in effect. It is, however, manifest that there was a difference in the policy pursued in either case by the conqueror. In the case of Israel, there was an actual deportation of the bulk of the population to remote provinces, and a planting in of a foreign colony, which grew in two centuries into a thriving population, with strong local attachments and jealousies. In the case of Judah, we merely find that the few leading thousands of the nation were taken into custody and removed to the capital of the empire, where, under the eye of the sovereign, they speedily raised themselves in consideration and importance. The ten tribes, moreover, had largely forfeited their nationality before their forced migration severed the last remaining tie, that of locality.

They had for ages previously lost the bond of the law and the sacrifices, and expelled the salt of the olden nation,—the tribe of Levi and its priests. They had become, by dynastic influence, and by inveterate habit, thoroughly penetrated by the usages of heathenism. If we allow that they retained circumcision, which, however, is 'not of Moses but of the Fathers,' that was probably the only remaining ritual link between Israel as Joshua left and as Shalmanezar found it. And, as there is probably a limit of degradation up to which affliction may descend upon an individual or a nation with seasonable and purifying severity, but beyond which it merely tramples a refuse lump, out of which the vital spirit has been crushed before, so we may suppose that, in the case of the northern kingdom, this limit had been passed, whereas in the southern it had not been reached at the period of the respective captivity of each. Thus the former was merely a *caput mortuum*, although we trace Jewish blood, Jewish institutions, and even Jewish dynasties, in several parts of Asia Minor from this period downwards, and can hardly avoid connecting them with the captivity and dispersion of Israel. Probably, under the powerful impulse given to Judaism by Persian ascendancy, and by Alexander's liberality to the Jews, they may have subsequently rallied themselves back to greater purity. The captivity of Judah, however, was a concentrated essence, so to speak, of national spirit, the leading shoot of a still vigorous tree, 'the highest branch of the high cedar' (Ezek. xvii. 22). Here was a royal family, embedded in its royal tribe, that tribe itself having blended itself with another which also retained an earlier tradition of royalty, and their union the more forcibly imbued with the spirit of the Aaronic institutions, in proportion as it had absorbed the whole of what had once been in some degree diffused throughout the twelve tribes. Although a portion of the Jewish exiles appear to have been placed on the banks of the Chaboras¹ ('Chebar,' Ezek.), Babylon, the seat of the conquering monarchy, was the home of the captive monarchs, with their sad but illustrious train; and the tender sympathies which the mutual sorrow for a common woe called forth would be sure to find their outward expression in an unanimous resolution to resist denationalising influences. The imperial policy of Nebuchadnezzar, exactly tallying with the picture of self-idolising despotism which the Book of Daniel conveys, was to make his capital the repository of all the vanquished greatness of the world, and there to reign the central potentate, like Zeus on the Greek Olympus, king of the kings and lord of the

¹ The precise river intended by this name is not clearly made out by Scriptural geographers; the question seems to lie between an affluent of the Euphrates and of the Tigris.

lords of human kind, 'lifting up the head' of this or that 'dis-crowned' captive, as a sense of merit, pity, or caprice, might guide him. His preference, we know, fell on the exiled royalty of Judah; and large privileges to the captive nation would be the natural consequence of the favour granted to their prince.

Matters, however, were not left to the law of mere natural consequence. The prophets Ezekiel and Daniel were raised up, not only to bear future witness to great events, but to keep alive among the children of the captivity the penitential lessons of their chastisement. Nor even when the standard of Jehovah was again lifted up for their return, were such influences wholly lost upon the many who declined to follow it back to the 'mountain of the Lord's house.' Those who remained behind yet knew the work which God was doing for His people; and that consciousness, no doubt, animated their principle of obedience, and checked any tendency to careless adoption of heathen rites. The prominent feeling of that period of their return was a direct reaction, as might be supposed, from that disobedience of the law which had developed into idolatry; and that reaction tended to a minute and rigorously precise devotion to it. There is throughout the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah a tone of severe and painstaking obedience, both in leaders and people, which marks the point of departure of what, in its exaggerated form, afterwards became Pharisaism. It is visible here only in its earliest and innocent stage, before it became a varnished shell of human tradition. Similarly in our own history, the sensitive and God-fearing spirit of the first Reformers degenerated, through the climax of reaction from the grossness of Romanism, into the sour fanaticism of the Stuart Puritans. The difference mainly was, that Pharisaism gradually suffocated spiritual obedience beneath forms of literalism, whereas the Puritans grew extravagant in their contempt of forms until the spirit of unity and humility exhaled away for want of them. The great consideration evidently enjoyed by the Jews under the kings of Babylon increased under the Persian sovereigns, who were prepared at once by the religious sympathy of the Zoroastrian teaching, and by motives of state policy, especially in regard to the Egyptian frontier, to obey the voice of prophecy, and promote the return of the exiles. The main conception of that teaching appears to be the recognition of the spiritual principle in man by which he is allied to Deity; yet also of the conflict of good and evil in him, by virtue of which his state here is one of probation. This conception combated the creature-worship of the Chaldeans, while it was probably reconcilable with their astrology, and made common cause with the purer faith of captive Judah. On the other hand, the two

systems, brought thus into relation, mutually fecundated each other. The reformed dogma of the Magians drew largely from Jewish Scripture, whilst from their contact with Judaism a school of thought was generated whose latest fruit ripened in the Kabbala; and as the powerful patronage of the court of Persia shielded the renaissance of the house of Judah, no doubt, also, the same influence was largely instrumental in developing the Samaritan-worship of Jehovah, and superseding those foreign idolatries which had at first co-existed with it. We cannot but suppose that Persian ascendancy, whilst it re-opened Judæa to her children, made the provinces beyond the Euphrates more tolerable and even desirable as a residence. The effect of this was, that the Jews were 'dispersed,' as seen in the Book of Esther, 'among the people in all the provinces of the kingdom' of the great King. Thus the territories between the Caspian and the Tigris, which afterwards formed the nucleus of the Parthian empire, were early saturated with Jewish colonies; and hence the close interest felt by the rising power of Parthia in the declining Jewish state of later times.

The fathers of the captivity returned, not only sobered by adversity, but well matured in all the state wisdom and experience of government which could be acquired in the then preponderating empire of the world. They had risen within its bosom to its highest offices; and while they received back from it the privilege of national existence, they enjoyed the distinction of being entrusted with its frontier on the only doubtful side, that of Egypt. They seem also to have imbibed the principle of political centralization far more fully during their Babylonian experience; and its influence was manifest on their return. Jerusalem then became more than ever at once the head and the heart of the nation. Nehemiah himself records the institution of the offering of the third part of a shekel towards the temple-service by all the people. This was probably permanent, and in principle may be connected with two Mosaic precepts (Exod. xxx. 12, and Deut. xvi. 16, 17). It became a practical bond of sympathy which kept alive among the Jews of the dispersion a feeling that they still had a country. The Feast of Tabernacles had not been kept from the time of Joshua to that of Josiah; but most probably from this time forward, except during the terrorism of Antiochus IV. (Epiphanes), it was never again intermitted. The most formidable barrier to the new commonwealth of Judæa lay in their northern neighbours and rivals, the Samaritans. The exacerbation between them was the result of several concurrent circumstances. The Samaritans were a thriving people when the first caravan of Judæan exiles returned across the Jordan. The vacancy on their southern border had, no doubt, been main-

tained in some degree by a wholesome awe of venturing on soil on which lingered the curse of a Deity whom they had learned to fear, and in part to serve. It is probable that the soil of Samaria had been, previously to the captivity of Judah, drained of any zealous Israelites by the extended influence of the southern kingdom under Hezekiah and Josiah. The painful strictness with which the long-indulged temptations to idolatry in alien marriages were forbidden by Nehemiah, repelled men of lax and careless minds, who found in Samaria something not quite heathen, nor yet so rigidly Jewish as the prevailing sentiment at Jerusalem demanded. Thither accordingly they took refuge. And the rich young community began, in the spirit of a *νεοπλούτος*, to counterfeit and alloy everything, on maintaining the genuineness of which the poorer settlers of ancient race felt a national pride. The patronage of Persia, as is always the case when a worldly stimulus is applied to a spiritual duty, made the return to some extent popular and fashionable among those who cared little for their God and law; thus Samaria, no doubt, benefited by the steady draught of settlers from the region of the Euphrates which now set in upon the land of Israel. There were many, no doubt, of both captivities who had grown utterly careless in religion, but who clung, with that fibrous tenacity which characterises the traditions of an exiled race, to the usages of their national seat, and felt a mere earthly love of their fatherland. Feelings of interest and mere curiosity would draw many more; restlessness and hopes of greater independence, a smaller but still an important number. This desultory multitude, whether descended lineally of the line of Israel or of Judah, would wander gradually backward to Judæa or to Samaria, according as they wished to follow the strict law of Moses or the debased imitation of its rites. Hence the keen feeling of competition in every interest, temporal or spiritual, between the two communities. Sanballat, the watchful intriguer, had married his daughter to the high-priest's son; that son refused to sever the tie in deference to what he thought the needless preciseness of spirit then manifested in Jerusalem. He became a renegade, and went over to the rival side; a priest of Aaron's seed, but whose children were tainted by that alien blood which was a bar to Aaronic privileges. It was for his ministry that the Samaritan temple was built, and a further pretension thus put forth by Sanballat, the inheritor of the policy of Jeroboam. No doubt his kin forswore, and his countrymen abhorred his memory; and yet, probably, he had many followers, who found the abandonment of domestic ties too severe a test of human duty to a Divine law, and went away with execration on their heads. Thus as the 'vine of God' took root anew, the thorn had already pre-occupied a place of

vantage at its side. Domestic discord and religious animosity were mixed up in that schism with the ranklings of political rivalry and personal resentment. More wide and sore grew the gulf as the relations of Samaritan and Jew were mingled in the conflict of the Seleucian and Ptolemæan dynasties. But, more than all this, when Judæa emerged from persecution into independence, and became, at the close of the second century B. C., the leading power of western Asia, John Hyrcanus, the most powerful of her kings, subjected to his sway the entire region north of Judæa. The Samaritan capital was at that time Sychem,—the city of Samaria having been destroyed and re-founded as a Syro-Greek colony by Alexander the Great. The Jews, thus victorious, neither extirpated nor mixed with their hated subjects; but we may be sure that their hour of ascendancy was one of humiliation and distress for Samaria. They became an 'oppressed nationality;' but Jews are the historians in this instance, and the tale of their oppression remains untold. In later days, when Herod, in his suspicious hatred of his subjects, began to build strongholds about his dominions, the restoration of Samaria, under the name of Sebaste, was his first and principal step towards that malignant security. He may, perhaps, have thought it politic to foster dissensions among his subjects, and so divert their hatred from himself. The embittered feelings with which their old execrations must have burst forth anew on the spawn of heathenism and apostasy, rising thus again to vigorous enmity under the auspices of the most hateful of tyrants, can perhaps be but faintly conceived by ourselves, but they speak out in those words, which the previous considerations may help us to appreciate, 'Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a devil.'

The effect of the course of events from the period of Nehemiah till the armed entry of the Romans under Pompey must, on the whole, have been to compress the limits of the Samaritan territory. Before the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar, the frontier of Judah and Benjamin had, especially under Josiah, rather advanced on its northern side; and probably the cities of Benjamin, which had always from Joshua's time been possessed, as they were first won from the Canaanite, by Ephraim, reverted to their original allotment when the bow of Ephraim was finally broken. The 'city called Ephraim' (John xi. 54) was undoubtedly on Judean ground; and its name can be more easily accounted for, if we suppose it won from the Israelitish monarchy, and so incorporated with Judah, before the traditions of the most powerful of the ten tribes had been supplanted by the intruding Cushites. If, indeed, it was that 'Ophrah of Benjamin' (so called because the memory of its first allotment survived under Ephraimitic possession), with which Mr. Stanley

('Sinai and Palestine,' p. 210) identifies it, the later nomenclature is still further vindicated, as preserving the tradition of its successful recovery. It is far from clear where the Samaritan southern border ran at the Christian era. Josephus (*De Bell. Jud.* III., iii. 4, 5) makes 'the Acrabatene toparchy' the most northerly of those into which Judæa was then divided, and the limit of Samaria. If this correspond with the ancient *Akrabbim*, that limit included the site of Shiloh as well as Bethel in Judæa; and this seems the most probable view.

The Samaritans had envied Judæa in her hour of prosperity, coveted her hard-earned privileges, thwarted her long precarious revival, and deserted¹ her manful stand against the persecutors of their common faith, and they quailed before the renewed lustre of the Jewish monarchy under the dynasty of the patriotic priests. Although the Jordan remained their eastern border, northward, southward, and westward they were hemmed in by the dominant population; while the only accession to their power was one which increased the alloy of their race and institutions, viz., the encouragement given by Herod to every foreign element, which led to a large influx of Greek and Syrian settlers. It is no wonder then that thus, in Jewish eyes, corrupted and debased as the meet reward of their suppleness and perfidy, they earned that contempt which outlives hatred. Such rancour ever weakens those who indulge it. The Samaritans, posted in the middle of the region which owned allegiance to the authorities of Judæa, divided its unity, and became a centre of disaffection; and thus the lasting grudge which the Jews bore them recoiled on that uncharitable race, and, by keeping Samaria for ever unassimilated with the Jewish nationality, effectually barred the consolidation of the commonwealth. Had the victory of king Hyrcanus over them been followed up by the policy shown to the Idumæans, the Samaritans might, surrounded as they were by Judaic influences, have gradually woven up their own interests with those of their conquerors, and there might not have been that fatal chasm in the political outline of the country which their estrangement caused. But the opportunity of

¹ The story that the Samaritans, under the persecution of Epiphanes, invited idolatry to the temple of Gerizim, and put prominently forward the heathen side of their descent, as though they disclaimed any part or lot in the persecuted faith or race of Israel, and wished to make out their case to be that of mere strangers and sojourners, must be placed side by side with another, that, when they found Alexander the Great had granted the Jewish people remission of tribute in the sabbatical year, they put forward their claim to the same privileges, as being likewise of Hebrew descent, and a Sabbath-keeping people. The whole rather reminds one of the two prize odes of Simonides on the mules' victory in the race, in which the horses' and asses' side of the pedigree came forward in turn as the poet was well or ill compensated for his strain. It has been suspected of being a Jewish scandal, perpetuated by Josephus; but it seems a fact that *Zeûs ἑνός* occupied for a time the shrine on Mount Gerizim, and there is nothing in the statements intrinsically improbable.

magnanimity elapsed and never returned, and thus they had no stake in the war of independence; for, owing doubtless to the same jealousy of giving them the power to annoy, their resources had not been developed, nor their tenable posts occupied with garrisons, until the Romans came. The fortification of the Mons Itabyrius within their territory was only resolved on at the last moment, and executed in forty days by the Jews, when preparing to defend themselves against Vespasian. Josephus speaks of a tumultuous assemblage on Mount Gerizim, which, although there was no certainty that the demonstration was hostile, that careful commander thought it prudent to crush, before he marched on Judæa. The same authority informs us that, whilst the larger part of Galilee still remained unsubdued, the whole of Samaria was parcelled out by Roman posts,¹ who thus, commanding as they did the coast road by Cæsarea, completely intercepted all communications on the west of Jordan. So when Galilee fell, the fugitives from Gischala, as those from Itabyrius, had no refuge² but Jerusalem; nor was there a single fortified post to harass the march of the enemy upon the capital, where a barrier of strongholds might have prolonged resistance and husbanded the chances of war. This was in fact the case in the insurrection under Bar-Chocab, when the whole brunt of the struggle fell on Samaritan soil, and when a large number of Samaritans were enlisted amongst the Jewish troops. The town of Bethar, on the edge of the Samaritan territory towards the sea, was then the last stronghold in which the breath of independence was drawn; but there, too, it is said, the ancient enmity broke out in the crisis of the struggle, and to the treachery of the Samaritan allies was ascribed the last fatal advantage which secured the entry to the foe.

The Samaritans seem to have mimicked Jewish institutions, having a council like the Sanhedrin, and probably synagogues and schools; but they were ever ductile to the influence of a foreign element, which so largely mingled in their origin; and accepted indifferently Persian, Greek, Syrian, and Roman dominion. And when, on the death of Herod, the long-suppressed feelings of the country at once broke out in Judæa, Galilee, and Peræa, Samaria alone amidst the general disaffection was noticed by the Roman prefect as having been tranquil. The apathy of a neighbour is often more provoking than the active enmity of one more remote, and the supineness of Samaria amidst the eager glow of public feeling was likely not to be forgotten in the long score which the Jew reckoned up against her. And

¹ Φρουραὶς διέληπτο De Bell. Jud. III. vii. 32.

² Josephus relates that Joppa, after its capture and destruction by the Romans, was rebuilt and occupied by some such fugitives; but the exception only proves the statement in the text.

certainly those feelings, originally so bitter, became entwined in his bosom with his own rigid patriotism, grew more intense as Pharisaism despotized over the popular mind, and culminated at the moment when the staff of power passed away from Judah, and foreign oppression fanned intestine bigotry to a fiercer flame.

It may be noticed, in illustration of the ill-will of the Samaritan population towards our Lord, 'because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem,' that Josephus mentions a fierce outbreak of the same populace on some Galilæans on their way to keep the passover. The affair, which took place in the reign of the emperor Claudius, became at last so serious, that, after a second investigation by the Roman local governor, it was remanded to Rome for the emperor's personal cognisance, and resulted in the punishment of some Samaritans and Jews, who had resented by outrage the wrongs of their Galilæan friends, as well as in the disgrace of the Roman officers, Cumanus and Celer, who had displeased the emperor by their decision. This result, however, was rather gained by the influence of Agrippa than by the merits of the case. (Joseph. *Antiq.* XX. v.)

The Samaritans, however, were far from being the only strangers on Jewish soil. The Seleucian monarchy, in several of its stages, promoted the settlement of Greeks and Syrians throughout the country, as is betrayed by the nomenclature of any map of Palestine which represents the period. This was followed by the conquests of king Hyrcanus, who probably reduced all these foreigners to the payment of a severe tribute; but the Jewish population resisted fusion with them, and left them so many seats of strange or hostile influence, not having perhaps any common bond of organization, but ready to be turned to account by the invader whenever he sought to make his footing sure. A number of these foreign cities were freed from Jewish supremacy by Pompey, and placed under the protectorate of Rome as portions of its province of Syria. Their names were Hippus, Scythopolis, Pella, Samaria, Marissa, Azotus, Jamnia, Arethusa, Gaza, Joppa, and Dora, afterwards Cæsarea.¹ In many of them were resident Jews and Syro-Greeks in two unblended populations, a state of things which kept enmities always at the mark for explosion. At Cæsarea, where this fact was more marked than elsewhere, some wanton irritation of Jewish feelings on the part of the aliens ended in a street fight and massacre, so that, says Josephus, 'all Cæsarea was emptied of its Jews.' The same ill-omened chapter which records this bears the heading, 'Calamities and Massacres of

¹ These, however, were not the only seats of alien population in Palestine; Ptolemais in Galilee, and Philadelphia in Perea, were built by Ptolemy Philadelphus, as Egypto-Greek colonies; Herod's policy added others.

the Jews everywhere,' i. e. throughout Syria and her Gentile outposts on Jewish soil. The Jews, after this outrage at Cæsarea, retaliated with fury on all these sojourning townsmen, who had probably had no share in the offence; and a list of sixteen places is given by Josephus, where they dealt havoc among the aliens with fire and sword, spreading wide the margin of devastation to include the neighbouring villages, and ruthlessly slaughtering a vast number of captives. The whole of Syria rose in tumult at the fearful tale, and the pendulum of retaliation swept again a larger circle of atrocities. The wretched Jews who divided Scythopolis with the aliens, thought to win their confidence by taking part in the strife against their own brethren, but they only yielded the Gentile a double vengeance; and from the sum of the suffering, the Jewish population of three cities only throughout Syria and Phœnicia is to be deducted as having been spared. Naturally enough the Jews improved the opportunity of their position to recapture the cities which Pompey had torn from the conquests of Hyrcanus; and as they were isolated and weak, save as forming a basis for invasion, they fell mostly into the hands of the Jews before the last outbreak against the Romans; and similarly some of these same hybrid settlements were amongst the first reduced by the enemy when active measures began. Too much importance can hardly be assigned to the effect which these little seminaries of hostile feeling, scattered throughout the land, had, in breaking up society in peace, and in preventing all hope of union in war. Besides Samaria, driven like a wedge into the heart of the country, there were about a dozen towns in the Jewish territory, where the irritability of the mixed populations kept up latterly a state of chronic civil war. On the south were the Idumæans, a sort of half-tamed Arabs, whose relationship to the Jews was no good guarantee for their friendship; throughout the frontier regions tumult and pillage, growing into a normal state, marked the gradual increase of the bands of Zealots; while many of the wealthy and quiet among the population of the large towns made private overtures to the enemy. And whilst Pharisee and Sadducee still strove amid the ruin of their country for the empire of the mind, a religion of the heart was springing up, which drafted off to itself whatever was left of pure spirituality, and left a vacuum at the core of the national life. Thus all that could contribute to inflame disorder reigned unchecked, whilst the only soothing palliative was cast forth. Not only the zealots with the men of order, but zealots with zealots, and priests with chief-priests, joined issue of battle in the capital, and divided the rabble among their factions, whilst the eagles of vengeance were slowly gathering beneath the walls.

We are tempted to inquire into the causes which, not in Palestine alone, where local causes might account for it, but throughout the several great seats of empire, arts and commerce, both in the east and west, produced a nearly simultaneous outbreak against the Jews. Twice at Alexandria, and even at Damascus, where, shortly after our Lord's death, the Jerusalem priesthood had so much influence, onslaughts of persecution followed rapidly; whilst from Rome itself they had been expelled by a decree of the same emperor Claudius, the beginning of whose reign had seemed a new era of imperial favour for them. Some feeling generally diffused seems traceable in these movements against the Jews. It is remarkable that Antioch, the next great city to Rome and Alexandria, is expressly mentioned among those which showed forbearance to the Jews, especially when connected with the fact that the Jews of that city were universally despised by their brethren as the most degraded of their race.¹ Yet at Antioch, too, about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, the populace, eager to credit any scandal of the Jewish sojourners, broke out into uproar on the false charge of a Jewish plot to burn the city, destroyed the synagogue, and burnt large numbers of Jews. The rise of Pharisaism, and its gradually general diffusion throughout the popular tone of Judaic practice, made the Jews of the last two centuries B. C. a far less amiable and interesting people than when they had drawn the respectful homage of Alexander. Nor had the Greek mind at that time, as shown in the anecdote² of Aristotle, lost its power of appreciating the better points of the Jew. Of all the Asiatic races which the Greek encountered, the Syrian was the one with which he most readily mingled. The effeminacy of that country seems to have been precisely the temptation most powerful for his sensitive and beauty-loving soul; accordingly it found out the weak point of his character, and penetrated its pores, and sapped its grain. As in the Saxon and Norman races, when mixed, the moral power of the former gave a new and firm basis to the intellectual and physical superiority of the latter, so, conversely, in the Syrian and Greek, the moral effeteness of the former seems to have palsied whatever of vigour the latter possessed. A similar influence, though to a less extent, was observable in Egypt, where the fusion of races was

¹ It seems clear that greater laxity of practice and a less rigid separation from heathen fashions prevailed among the Jews at Antioch than elsewhere. The great success of the Gospel in this city was also in some measure doubtless produced by the absence of that powerful bigotry which impeded it where the standard of Judaism was strict. Such an outbreak, therefore, at Antioch seems a climax of feeling against them.

² Given on the authority of Clearchus, the pupil of Aristotle, by Josephus. (Contr. Apion, lib. i.)

less complete than in Syria; but the mob of Alexandria seem in all ages to have been intolerant, in proportion as the educated classes there imbibed from the vast number of competing schools and sects something of the feeling of toleration. But, whilst the numerous populations amongst which they dwelt were rolling loose and free from every wholesome restraint in the rout of Comus and of Circe, the Jew was growing more rigid to external contact, and more precise in strait-laced forms. As he came more and more out into sight among the nations of the West and North, the Jew had lost all relish for the jocund pleasantries or gross licentiousness which blended imperceptibly around the altars of Dionysius and Artemis. As he was better known he was less liked; and if these demoralized races resented the moral superiority which he showed, they were piqued even more by the sanctimonious distance at which he kept them. Their languor of self-indulgence was thus chafed occasionally into a frenzy of persecution against him, whose scruples warmed not to the glow of love and song, and whose pride in his strange ritual refused the harmony of the world. Commercial rivalry added a keener spur, perhaps, to these feelings of antipathy. The Jew also was found capable of organizing intrigue, of seducing by stealthy proselytism to his party those who were bound to another allegiance, and of mischievously influencing the weaker minds of women, especially those whose wealth was ascertained. He, as it were, stuck in the throat of ancient civilization, and could neither be crushed, absorbed, nor rejected. The favour enjoyed by Herod with Augustus, and subsequently by both the Agrippas with Claudius, gave an exceptional court patronage to the unhappy race during those periods; but it is clear that the power of Pallas, or some favourite of the same class, was rising at Rome when the appeal on the question between the Jews on the one side, and the Samaritans and Cumanus on the other, was brought thither for the emperor's decision. Josephus¹ expressly says that the freedmen of the palace sided with the latter party, and that the former triumphed through the influence of Agrippa the younger with the empress Agrippina. But when Felix the brother of Pallas was, a short time after, appointed procurator of Judæa, he probably wished to have a clear field open for profitable misgovernment, and with that view procured, through the influence of Pallas, a decree which might effectually prevent all such unpleasant investigations. At any rate, some such intrigue of the palace, we venture to suggest, may have been the reason of the injunction to 'all Jews' to 'depart from Rome.'

The Syro-Greek kingdom or empire, as during a brief period

¹ Antiq. XX. v. 3.

it may be called, was, together with Egypt, the latest source of influence to the political and social state of the Hebrew race, till the Romans came to gather the prickly fruit of conquest on its soil. And never perhaps was a country, amply dowered by nature with sources of wealth, so cursed by a dynasty of despots alike unscrupulous and incapable. It was an unhappy omen for Judæa that her last race of native sovereigns, the Asmoneans, borrowed their traditions of royalty from the worthless Seleucidæ, against whom they revolted, instead of 'looking to the rock whence they were hewn.' This was one thing which provoked the disaffection of the Pharisees, the growing representatives of popular feeling, and gave the royal sway almost the air of an external protecting power rather than that of an homebred and honoured chieftaincy. Like the kings of Syria, Hyrcanus and Jannaëus had mercenary troops of reckless ferocity, who knew no ties of country, and owned no civil obedience, were directly at variance with the spirit of the constitution, and seemed to prove that the king was placed above the law; and like them, the latter sovereign affected the arrogant caprice of which Persian despotism furnishes the earliest examples. Under the Seleucian monarchy the army appears to have principally consisted of hireling Greeks, a fickle horde maintained by tribute or plunder, (two resources substantially the same, and chiefly differing in the mode of collection,) wrung at random from helpless provinces, and when this failed, by a shameless spoliation of shrines. It was a state necessity to divert these troops from rebellion by new wars. Almost equally ready to turn their arms against their paymaster, or his rival, or each other, they became, on an imperial scale, the bloody tools of that profligate perfidy of which, with its congenial vices, as having flooded the private life of Italy, the Roman satirist three centuries later complains. In the aguish state of the body-politic caused by such vicissitudes of excitement, the mutiny of an army became the revolt of a province, and threatened the dismemberment of the empire. But it was not the fact of the troops being hired foreigners, which so debased the chief instrument of power; for mercenaries, if well led, have achieved great things both in ancient and modern times. It was the mercenary spirit which prevailed in the leaders, in the sovereign, in the state itself, which ruined it. The vast commonwealth of the West which later, though not slowly, followed in these degenerate traces, bequeathed at any rate its traditions of law and arts and arms to every conquered race. It bridged nations, gave the fairest part of the earth the self-consciousness of civilization, and was at last an imperial aqueduct of Christianity to the world. But the Syro-Greek supremacy, after the death of the first Seleucus, was little else than a greedy

scramble of base natures for the means of indulging their worst appetites on a vast scale. Embracing some of the richest and loveliest tracts which skirt the eastern Mediterranean, and sweeping thence in widely watered plains to the huge tablelands which connect the Caucasus with the Himalaya, the dominion of the Seleucidæ contained all the physical conditions of empire, together with sufficient compactness to adjust the relations of the extremities to the centre. And yet no empire at once so wealthy, so extensive, and so compact, was ever so viciously weak in organization, and in none did the frivolity of ambition make such sport with all the objects for which government exists, or vileness accumulate such vast powers for mischief. After the first debilitating blow given by the Romans to the power of the third Antiochus, from which Syria never fully recovered, it began to wane before the rising star of Parthia in the north-east; and against the despised and trampled Judæans in the south, its arms found their *prestige* fatally impaired. In a later stage its decay was indicated by those reptile-swarms bred by the dissolution of its vast frame, the plunderers by land and sea who broke forth to riot in the weakness of law. The Cilician angle of the Levant teemed with pirates, whilst the roving Arabs of the southern desert advanced as a superior race against the degenerate paradise of the Hollow Syria. Pompey, with the power of the Mediterranean at his back, was able to hunt the pirates into their creeks, and exterminate them; but the Petræan Arabs, though severely checked by Jannæus, the last substantial monarch of the Asmonæan race, were invited to rescue Damascus from the perils of Syrian power, and the connexion then established, although not perhaps continuously, survived at least to the days of S. Paul.

But the biography of its princes is the key to the moral state of the Seleucian empire. As a specimen of human character at its worst, let the reader open on the leading names so often repeated, in the two sexes—'Antiochus,' 'Seleucus,' 'Cleopatra,' 'Arsinoë,' in the index to Prideaux' work embracing the history of the period. That of 'Antiochus' shows a succession of fourteen personages of princely rank, of whom eleven died by violence, and of those eleven the majority by assassination. Similarly under 'Seleucus,' we find that six out of seven so called were poisoned or otherwise murdered, and that the remaining one died a Parthian captive, by accident in hunting. If we glance at the women's share of the plot in this court tragedy of two centuries, we shall find six Cleopatras and four Arsinoës whose connexions lie nearly equally in Syria and in Egypt, whose royal families were successively linked by several of their marriages. Accordingly the crimes and sufferings of both dynasties

mark their biography. The first Cleopatra on the list, own sister to Alexander the Great, was murdered by order of Antigonus. The second is the only one of the series who died without violence. The third, 'a queen of Syria' (we quote the brief epitome of the index) . . . 'occasions the death of her husband' . . . 'murders her own son to reign in his stead' . . . 'attempts to murder another son' . . . 'forced to drink 'poison.' The fourth was 'murdered by her own sister Tryphæna' (who was in turn slain by the husband of the victim). The fifth was 'killed by her son Alexander.' The sixth and last, the famous Queen of Egypt, has supplied a moral and a tale wherever either history or poetry is read. Of the four Arsinoes there was one banished, there were two put to a violent death, while the fourth tries our moral sense most severely of all, leaving a painful memory of womanhood debased, a quiet and gentle character befouled with the stain of incest. Such are the male and female traditions of royalty amidst which was nurtured the last effort of Judæa to be an independent monarchy. However pure the patriotism in which that monarchy was founded, and however moderate the constitutional powers at first assigned to it, such a colossal example of triumphant vice could hardly fail of influencing it for evil.

We learn from the history of S. Paul that there were several synagogues of Jews at Damascus, and, from that city being the first beyond the limits of Judæa marked for persecution, as well as from all the circumstances of the narrative, it is clear that correspondence was systematically kept up between it and Jerusalem, and that the Judæan hierarchy had obtained a complete influence, not only over the synagogue authorities, but over 'the governor under Aretas the king.' It is not unlikely that the public sympathy with S. John the Baptist was so far shared by the priestly party at Jerusalem as he was the son of a priest, and that the public detestation of Herod Antipas' unlawful connexion with Herodias may have led to some alliance between the Jerusalem authorities and Aretas, who made war on Herod because that connexion caused the divorce of his daughter. Thus at Damascus, where, as Josephus informs us, nearly all the women were of the Jewish persuasion (*De Bell. Jud.* II. xx. 2), and where male Jews were also numerous, the massacre of the Jewish population is a highly significant fact, as showing how widely spread the public feeling against them must have been.

None of the neighbouring countries offered so little to influence the Jew as Phœnicia. With her back to the mountains, and her face to the sea, and her narrow coast strip of territory sloping to the latter, it was towards the setting sun that the fertilizing genius of commerce looked for her floating empire;

nor is there a single country of the Mediterranean basin which up to a late period—probably that of John Hyrcanus—had so little intercourse with her as her nearest neighbour. There must indeed, from a very early age, have been a line of traffic passing through the north of Galilee, between Damascus and Zidon, doubling the southern shoulder of Hermon, and cutting the Jordan valley a little below the ‘waters of Merom.’ This no doubt tended to make and keep it ‘Galilee of the Gentiles.’ We know also that the last inland outskirts of the Phœnician territories lay on the very head of the Jordan, and from them was seized by some Danite rovers the town named after their tribe, which formed the northern limit of Israel. It was, like Berwick-upon-Tweed, a monument of successful encroachment; while the phrase applied by the sacred historian to the inhabitants, ‘dwelling careless, after the manner of the Zidonians, quiet and secure’ (Judges xviii. 7), shows how little anxious the Phœnicians were about their hold on the interior. It was probably a principal stage of the Damasco-Zidonian caravans; but there is no reason for thinking that the maritime power ever attempted its recovery. The only Phœnician development in Jewish history, besides the commercial treaty of Hiram and Solomon, was the affinity between the houses of Ahab and Eth-Baal, and that was cut short by the quickly-following captivity of the kingdom of Israel, and subsisted only during the period of that kingdom’s decline.¹ And, when the first Assyrian inroad swept away the independence of the Northern tribes, no doubt settlers poured in from the Hollow Syria, and scantily perhaps from Phœnicia too. Yet in later times the Jewish proved the dominant population of the border, even as the Anglo-Saxons in Scotland overflowed northwards, and the Celts retired before them. This is clear from our Saviour’s deigning a personal visit to the place, and from his reply to the woman (Matt. xv. 24), and indeed is implied in the exceptional particularity with which S. Matthew and S. Mark describe her nation and race. And even in Phœnicia Proper, whither our Lord did not go, many Jews were to be found settled in the great commercial towns of that coast, which still were seats of thriving trade, though no longer of first-rate importance since the rise of Alexandria and Antioch. We learn from S. Luke (Acts xi. 19), that the missionaries dispersed by the first persecution of the Church, ‘travelled as far as Phœnicia . . . preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only.’ It was in a Phœnician ship that

¹ There is one mention of ‘Tyrians’ in the Book of Nehemiah (xiii. 16), but the word is suspicious, as it does not occur in the LXX. Greek; nor is the fact of there being Tyrians then at Jerusalem employed as fish-merchants one intrinsically probable.

S. Paul returned from Patara after his last visit to the Churches of Asia Minor before his imprisonment; and it was at Tyre that on landing he found 'certain disciples,' and among them one with the gift of prophecy, who warned him of the perils to befall him in Jerusalem. The general policy of the Roman empire tended to promote communication and develop traffic, and no doubt more intercourse between Judæa and Phœnicia existed under Roman dominion than at any other period of their history.¹

The kindred southern nations of Idumæa and Arabia, the Edomites and Ishmaelites of the Old Testament, have a curious relation to the character and fortunes of the Jews. The Israelites represent the domesticated branch of the same stock originally, of which the Arabs are the wild species, and of which the Idumæans were a less perfect and intermediate development. Whilst the Jews have alone, of all the ancient nations, scattered themselves over positively all the modern world of civilization and commerce, the Arabs alone of all nations have maintained their hold unsubdued upon the same few hundred leagues' square area of territory which first received them in its arid bosom. They occasionally diverge and emerge from these unenvied seats, when some greater desolation than ordinary enlarges the practical desert, and widens the scope of their independent and half-chivalrous ravages. The dominion of the Turk in Syria has given them such an opportunity, and the black tents of the Bedouins, or the hovel walls which they have ceased to canopy, may be seen anywhere from Suez to the Lebanon, and to the promontories which push far south into the Indian Sea. They remain despite of every empire, from the Assyrian to the British, of gunpowder, printing, and the steam-engine, completely the monument of patriarchal mankind, as isolated as though the Saracens had never gone forth from among them on a career of conquest, civilization, and decay. With regard to their influence on Judæan history Dr. Edersheim says (p. 68):—

'As troubles at home and abroad obliged the Hebrews to seek shelter in more distant regions, the number of Jews in Arabia increased. Their comparatively settled mode of living, their cultivation and wealth, must have secured for them a peculiar influence among the Nomadic tribes of that country. No doubt they improved their position, amongst other ways, in attempting to gain proselytes. During the administration of Herod's father, the royal princes were, in times of danger, entrusted to the safe keeping of the Arabians. At a later period, many Jews passed with Gallus across the Red Sea into Arabia. The Talmud mentions the Jewish settlements in Arabia, and records some ordinances referring to them. When the Romans took possession of the Holy Land, a considerable number of Jews retreated to the neighbourhood of Medina. In

¹ The word *ἐπιφθεῖται* (Acts xii. 20) seems to imply a trade in corn, probably carried on by sea from Casarea and Joppa, between Phœnicia, a commercial and corn-importing country, and Palestine.

general, Jewish settlements were numerous and ancient in that district, specially at Cheibar, four or five days' journey from Medina. Tradition asserted that the ancestor of these Jews, Cheibar, who gave his name to the whole district, was brother to Jathrib, the founder of Medina. There, and around Mecca, warlike Jewish tribes had reared and held fastnesses. Isolated from their countrymen in Palestine, they adopted many heathen practices. At a much later period Eldad-ha-Dani visited them, and described their state. He calls them descendants of the tribe of Ephraim. They were then partly fire-worshippers, and conjoined with this service certain licentious rites. The same authority distinguishes also between the sons of Zebulun and those of Issachar. The former, he states, were warlike, while the latter were peaceable, and mostly engaged in commerce. But even the much earlier testimony of the Talmud shows that the heathen customs, and the peculiar forms of idolatry and immorality common in these districts, were well known to the Jewish authorities. It perhaps deserves to be mentioned, that the same authorities interpret the Cush of the Bible as Arabia, although that term refers, no doubt, also to the coast of Ethiopia, opposite to Arabia. This Jewish interpretation of Cush tallies also with the statement of a certain king of the Arabians to one of the Rabbins—Akiba, "I and my wife are Cushites." But Judaism was not merely tolerated, it became dominant in Arabia. The first Jewish king of the Homerites, Aba-Caeb-Asad, flourished about the year 120 before Christ. Some, however, fix his reign at a much earlier date. He is stated to have been the thirty-second king of the Sabæans, and to have decorated the great Caaba.'

The same intense tenacity of the usages and distinctive features of races appears in these two kindred races; the one civilized, the other wild; the one dispersed and settled everywhere, the other geographically limited, but politically shifting. The same secondary love of commercial pursuits has been engrafted by the one upon the quiet agricultural habits under which Moses fixed them, and by the other upon the roving and plundering life of the desert. The Ishmaelites were the earliest known conductors of traffic between Egypt and Phœnicia, and the greatest development of Arabian importance before the time of Mahomet included the period of the Herods, and made Petra, now in its ruins a marvel of the world, at that time a chief emporium of its wealth. Any map which includes Babylon, Alexandria, and Tyre, will show at a glance the importance of Petra in ancient commerce. This city was the capital of the Edomites during their independence. They rebelled against the house of Judah, and 'broke from off their neck the yoke' of their brother; but the havoc of the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian and Egyptian armies, in the path of which their north-western border lay, appears in the sixth and fifth centuries before Christ to have distressed and reduced them. In the fourth century we find Petra in the possession of the 'Nabathæans,' the leading tribe (Nebaioth) of the sons of Ishmael, and with whom the Idumæans, in their reduced condition, partly coalesced. Another section of them had occupied

the Judæan solitudes during the Babylonish captivity, and had their head-quarters at Hebron, where they adopted the habits of Jews; and, when vanquished by John Hyrcanus, the best of the Asmonean princes, they embraced the Jewish faith, and were a toparchy of Judæa in the war with Titus. And, although many of their families may have been absorbed into the Jewish nation, there was still at that period a large body under native chiefs, who styled themselves a kindred nation, and the temple their ancestral sanctuary. After the fall of Jerusalem, all who had not shared its fortunes probably were gradually absorbed into the different desert tribes, and thus the intermediate branch of the patriarchal stock was lost in the two predominant types of the Arab and the Jew. Their chief influence on the later portion of Jewish history lies in the one fact, that they furnished the dynasty of the Herods, if dynasty it can be called,—for the first was the only substantial monarch of the line, and he, however hateful as a man and as a king, appears to have tyrannized impartially, and shown no invidious patronage to the race from which he sprang.

The adjacent pastoral tribes of Moab and Ammon similarly dissolved into the kindred races who roved over the Hauran. A 'land of Tob' (*i.e.* 'the good') is said to have lain somewhere east of Peræa, apparently where once was their territory, and to have been occupied by Jews at the period of the Maccabees. The Jewish settlements in Arabia have already been noticed. The roving dominion of an Aretas of the Herodian period had been so far consolidated, as for him to set up dynastic pretensions, and ally himself with the ruling house of Judæa. The daughter of that Aretas had been divorced by the tetrarch Antipas to make way for his brother Philip's wife, which gave rise to a war between them. In the account Josephus gives, it is clear that the Arab had levied his tribute right up to the walls of Machærus, on the eastern bank of the Jordan, and certainly at one time was master of the fortress itself. If, as seems most likely, Damascus had been in possession of the same Arabs during the last century before Christ, the permanent ascendancy which they thus acquired can have been due to nothing else than the decay of the great established monarchy which checked them, and the power which the vast traffic from Mesopotamia across the desert, and from Yemen up the gulf of Akaba, threw into their hands. Whether Rome or Carthage predominated in the West, a demand for the articles of Eastern opulence was sure to increase, and did in fact increase with every extension of Rome's western dominions. For these children of the desert to occupy wealthy cities and powerful fortresses, and command the entrepôts of the commerce of the East and West, although a

sample of what, under the Caliphs, they were afterwards to achieve, was singularly in contrast with their prevailing habits, and was a development, probably, only to be found among a few leading tribes favourably situated. The majority of them, no doubt, retained that aversion to walls and gates which so strongly marks their modern descendants. Nor ought we to forget that it was the policy of Rome to encourage their encroachments on the north-eastern border of Syria, as a counterpoise to the rising empire of the Parthians. When they held Machærus it is not probable that any city on the Jordan's eastern bank was strong enough to hold out against them, although their relations with Philip, the tetrarch of Ituræa and Trachonitis, were probably friendly for the very reason that they were hostile with Antipas; and, when friendly, they formed a powerful protection on a border completely exposed.

In order rightly to trace the various elements of the political and social state of the Jews at the Christian era, it will be necessary to follow them backwards to their simplest forms, as found in their earlier annals. As we view them there we are struck by the fact that, whereas the priesthood and all its relations are fixed by law in their minutest accessories, a great portion of their political constitution is left open. Joshua was appointed to succeed Moses, but for a continued succession of chief magistrates there was no definite provision; and this was because the Divine Autocracy was viewed as the fact which should from time to time regulate all secondary functions. The one attribute of sovereignty for the exercise of which there was a clear and fixed constitutional basis, was the judicial one. Yet even here, by placing the final appeal to 'the judge that shall be in those days,' (Deut. xvi. 18,) the law seems to contemplate some personage to be specially commissioned with supreme authority. The grave amplitude of detail with which the whole system of judicature is fixed, would alone be enough to stamp the Hebrew constitution with a marvellous maturity of wisdom in that early age, if it were supposed to proceed from a merely human source. It is, throughout, justice inspired with mercy as a principle; and the general humanity of its enactments may be favourably compared with that of any jurisprudence which the world has seen. To understand the judicial machinery of the Hebrew commonwealth, we must remember the domestic and patriarchal stage in which we first find it, and carry throughout its history the practice which then prevailed—expanded, indeed, to suit circumstances, and sometimes depraved or perverted by human frailty, but in the main retaining a fixed hold on the great principles which were its birthright. To the patriarchal aristocracy, the heads of tribes, or of divisions of tribes, or of

assemblages of families, or even of individual families, was entrusted the ordinary administration of justice. From the circumstances of the case, this was the only sovereign attribute which would be ordinarily in use. Legislation was not for them, for whom God had given laws, and to whom He could, when He pleased, speak again by 'His servants the prophets.' To declare peace or war was also a reserved attribute of the Divine Ruler. But questions would arise between man and man, and the supreme function of deciding them was, save in rare emergencies, part of the natural authority accruing by primogeniture.

The plan which Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, suggested for the adjudication of questions (probably civil only) was based on simple numerical divisions. The tribes were organized in thousands, subdivided into hundreds of families, an arrangement which is continuously traceable throughout the Old Testament history. Thus Gideon tells the angel that his 'thousand was the meanest (Judges vi. 15, margin) in Israel,' and Bethlehem is spoken of, in a well-known text, as 'little among the thousands of Judah.' When a tribe became territorially settled, the captains or chief elders of their thousands, &c., would naturally retain their office as 'judges and officers' in towns, and the arrangement would, from a purely numerical, become a local one. As a military organization, indeed, the numerical one remained a vital part of the national system. The 'seventy men of the elders of Israel' who shared prophetic privileges with Moses, were not, it seems, judges, but discharged the duty of teaching the will of God to the people, and maintaining obedience to it. In this they partook of the 'burden of the people' with Moses, and for this the 'Spirit which was upon' Moses was given to them. But they disappear from history and leave no successors, nor have they any connexion with the Sanhedrin of later days. The mere number of seventy proves nothing, for being a sacred number in the eyes of the Jews, it was sure to be selected on any grave and solemn occasion, for which it was not plainly unsuitable.¹ The only fixed authoritative elements in the civil state were the heads of tribes and heads of families, and between these two ranks more or less recognition was given, within limits which cannot be precisely fixed, to the heads of certain leading families. These were the arrangements common to all the kindred nations around them,² and always

¹ So Josephus, when sent to administer Galilee, finding its judicial affairs required rearranging, instituted a supreme court of seventy with inferior subordinate ones.

² See the case of the offence mentioned Numb. xxv. 14, 15, where there is a close parallelism between the rank of the Midianitish and Israelitish offender.

mark the growth of a nation out of a family. These two patriarchal ranks, the heads of tribes and the heads of families, meet us perpetually under various names; the more common name, however, for the first is, 'princes,' and for the second, 'elders.' By analogy, however, the title 'princes' is given to the leading elders of a city not unfrequently. Thus the 'princes of Succoth and the elders' (Judges viii. 14) numbered seventy-seven men. There is so much symmetry in the supposition that in this case the 'princes' were seven and the elders 'seventy,' both of them sacred numbers, that we might be inclined to think the concurrence not fortuitous. But at any rate, there is so much more general reason for supposing that their number must have always varied with the size of a place, that we forbear any generalization, especially as Succoth, being a place stamped with the traditions of Jacob's family, may have retained for its elders a number which was also that assigned to the souls with which that family went down into Egypt. There is, however, a general concurrence of phraseology, in favour of the supposition that a sufficient number of heads of families, in two ranks, with a greater or less scope of jurisdiction, were chosen by popular election in every city. The dispersion of the Levites throughout the land was meant to keep up the traditions by the help of which judicature might follow in the footsteps of law; and, probably, where a Levitical city was near enough, an appeal was usual to the decision of the Levitical elders there. 'Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates,' was the charge of the law-giver, as regarded the human means of justice; 'ye shall not be afraid of the face of men, for the judgment is God's,' was the principle on which he sought to secure its integrity. Nor was it until idolatry and apostacy darkened over the face of Israel that perversions of justice came to be a crying sin. The earlier annals singularly preserve, under the inspiration which guided them, the impulses of popular feeling, and show how keenly mal-administration in this branch of government was resented by the high-spirited independence of a race of free men. The same tone is current in the popular legends of early Roman history, and we may compare with the wickedness of Hophni and Phinehas, the judicial crimes of the decemvir Appius.

Nor under the human royalties of Judah and Israel were these forms abandoned, however tyranny may, as it always will, have corrupted their spirit. Thus Jezebel avails herself of the ordinary legal processes to destroy Naboth, and here too we find the 'elders and nobles,' resident in his city, charged with his trial. In smaller places, as Bethlehem, the single class of elders was probably sufficient. The simple mode of calling a court of attestation practised by Boaz (Ruth iv. 12), shows us

how far tradition and custom went in preserving the forms of law. If we apply to these princes and elders the term 'aristocracy' for want of a better, we ought to observe that it implies no exclusive privileges; for in this sense the only aristocracy were the tribe of Levi and family of Aaron, and the disqualification for holding landed property went far to balance any preference which they enjoyed. The organization of the commonwealth was always one of families, not of ranks or classes, and the sole preeminence which a few distinguished houses enjoyed was knit up in the same bond of brotherhood in which the highest and lowest were equally bound. Nor is the tone of the Book of Judges and of the records of the early monarchy reconcilable with the prevalence of anything except independence and equality. The chiefs or heads of tribes, together with the rulers or elders, wherever mentioned, (and their mention is rare,) only head and lead the people, but hardly guide, much less govern it. The predominant action of the narrative is popular throughout, and there appears to have been unfettered communication between the general mass of free Israelites and the prophet or judge whom Jehovah raised up to be the saviour of the moment. It is not till the later reigns of the monarchy of Judah that we trace the oligarchic influence of what are then called the 'princes.' No doubt, with idolatrous intermarriages must have come in a neglect of the laws which regulated descent and the tenure of property; and a few great holders began to rise and absorb the small freehold owners around them. Usury among brethren, in direct defiance of the Mosaic prohibition, must have followed the distress caused by the havoc of war; and usury, especially where there is little commerce to assist the development of capital, must soon eat up the equality of citizenship. The concentration of all the leading families within the walls of the capital, which, owing to the constant inroads of powerful enemies, became the normal state of the later monarchy of Judah, would necessarily further the growth of an oligarchy. Thus patriarchal simplicity was corrupted into palace etiquette. The heads of leading families who had saved within the city walls themselves and their moveable treasures, and had left the smaller folk whose natural stem and pillar they were, to be eaten up by Assyrian ravages, would seek to derive from the favour of the sovereign a dignity to compensate that which they had lost as the worshipful centres of local influence. Thus the patrimonial chiefs of the tribesmen became the minions of a court, or the caballers against its authority, according to the fluctuating strength of the monarchy. It is not, however, till its last deciduous stage in the days of Zedekiah that they appear as an organized body with some of

the functions of a privy council, having apparently (2 Chron. xxviii. 21) a treasury or common fund, a place of meeting, and collectively exercising a jurisdiction. A state¹ impoverished, a monarchy weak, and a growing oligarchy, are sure signs of downfall imminent, even without the overwhelming assault of the first power of the world. We may, in passing, remark that the local influence of the heads of thousands and other patriarchal dignities was probably the great obstacle in the way of extirpating the high-place worship. It appears from a passage in the Second Book of Chronicles (xxiv. 17, 18) that these 'princes' were the instigators of departure from the revived purity of Jehoiada's period. 'The king hearkened unto them, and they left the house of the Lord God of their fathers, and served groves and idols.' There is no doubt that these groves were mostly family sanctuaries, at first not idolatrous, but transitional towards idolatry, connected with the local influence of a leading 'elder.' Such was the case at Abiezer, as shown in the story of Gideon. The worship of Baal had evidently become domesticated there. Accordingly, in the earlier stages of the monarchy, the power of the king was too weak to contend with these strong local centres of divergent worship. The piety and long reign of Asa, succeeded and seconded by that of his son Jehoshaphat, failed, as is expressly recorded, to achieve this; and what we have just stated appears to be the account of the difficulty which they found. In the time of Hezekiah, however, when the centralizing influences of the later period had had time to operate, the difficulty was overcome. (2 Kings xviii. 4.) The abolition of high-place worship is there expressly recorded; and on referring to the parallel account in the Chronicles (2 Chron. xxix. 30; xxx. 2, 6, 12; xxxi. 8), we find the king and the princes mentioned as united in the effort then made for the reconstitution of religion. It seems, then, that whilst the nobles and elders held their native place among their tribesmen, their power, clinging, as it were, to the soil by the strong ties of nature, defied the influence of the monarch; but, when they were seduced or dislodged from that seat of tribune eldership, and gathered within the shadow of the throne, it found the means of swaying them for good or for evil; until, in the last days of foreign inroad and domestic oppression, all elements of government became uncertain, and unscrupulousness had its usual ascendancy.

We have endeavoured to elucidate the leading features of government, and the change from a patriarchal seniority to a

¹ The diminished resources of Judah are apparent from the extremely reduced tribute, 'an hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold,' to which the king of Babylon put the land. (2 Kings xxiii. 33.)

courtly oligarchy, which, under the late monarchy of Judah, the aristocratical element gradually underwent. It is clear that hardly anything in common with the hard-outlined scheme of local sanhedrims and synagogues of the Ptolemean, Maccabean, or Christian era, is traceable here. Dr. Raphall has a few flimsy and insufficient sentences on this head, which we quote, in order to impugn. He first propounds a view as that of 'orthodox Jews,' to which he then states certain objections, without pronouncing for or against orthodoxy; but continues as follows (Vol. ii. p. 108).

'If we examine the later books of the Old Testament, we shall find frequent mention made of the *Zekenim*, "elders." Indeed, on one occasion, before the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, we find the prophet Ezekiel (viii. 11, 12) speaks of the *Ziknay Israel*, "elders of Israel," as a constituted body, and even mentions the number of its assessors as 'seventy,—the very number originally appointed by Moses, and which afterwards constituted the Sanhedrin.' The view taken of the Sanhedrin by the orthodox is that its origin is due to Moses, and recorded in Num. xi.; and that it continued uninterruptedly, under a succession of chiefs, down to 500 A.D. The passage of Ezekiel to which our author refers is that in which he sees in a vision 'seventy men of the ancients,' or elders, of the house of Israel, 'with every man his censor in his hand,' standing before the forms of idolatry with which the Temple walls were covered. He saw a college of idolatrous priests, the number of which has already been accounted for; but there is no trace whatever of jurisdiction; and the term 'assessors' conveys a purely gratuitous insinuation that there was. In the ancient Hebrew polity there was, in fact, no room for a body like the Sanhedrin, unless the patriarchal seniority, in its latter days of oligarchical corruption, may be taken to be an approximation towards it.

But the purely patriarchal system became impossible after the return from captivity. The forced exile of those seventy years had indeed torn asunder that system in its vitals. One had been taken, and another left, of 'the thousands of Judah.' The tie which for several generations had been growing weaker between the 'princes,' or 'rulers,' and their tribesmen, was then rudely burst. The king of Babylon took all who were worth taking, and 'left of the poor of the land;' and the poor of the land, we may be sure, after the distress which the kingdom had undergone, must have increased out of all due proportion. This accounts for the very small numbers which are mentioned as carried away, and which Professor Newman¹ seems to think so improbable. Those who were taken went

¹ History of the Hebrew Monarchy, p. 323.

at several times, and perhaps to several different places, at any rate at first. But still, when they received permission to exercise self-government, as it seems clear, even during the Captivity, they did, they would naturally put the old fragments together, and let them grow into each other in whatever order was possible. The divulsion of elements was again renewed on their return. If we consider how, in the peaceful affluence of Babylonian and Persian patronage, the captives probably multiplied, and if we regard the numerous ties which enterprise and industry would form, it must be supposed that of kindred captive families many would remain, although many might return. The desultory flocking in of Israelites of the ten tribes, and doubtless of many refugees of Judah from Egypt and from the semi-Arab tribes of the southern and eastern borders, would strengthen the reviving state, but impair its genealogical symmetry. We must, however, beware of supposing that purity of race prevailed among the Jews at the period preceding the Captivity. At any rate, from the time of the Judges their lineage becomes more clearly mixed the later we descend in history. There was, firstly, the 'mixed multitude' from Egypt, who accompanied the people; there was the remnant of Canaanites who were 'put to tribute,' instead of being extirpated, among several of the tribes; there was the confusion incident to the oppressed state of the people under the Judges; there was, moreover, the pernicious example of Solomon, during whose long reign great impurity must have crept into the genealogical tables of his kingdom; and these several sources of pollution to the blood and lineage of the chosen race had more or less deeply tinged it before the worst and last period of its pre-Babylonian decline. No doubt the standard of purity was raised by Ezra (ix. x.) to a degree of strictness which had never prevailed in practice since Joshua's days; and many who were of blood repeatedly debased by such admixtures probably then joined in the renunciation of strange wives. From this period to the time of Alexander a mist descends on Jewish history, penetrable only at a few unconnected points; but when we begin again to read the face of the times, Pharisaism appears in its vigorous youth, before its fully-ripened acerbity provoked the reaction of Sadduceism. The gradual sympathy with Greek notions which, during the last two centuries before Christ, took hold on a large section of the nation, and divided it more and more widely into parties, factions, and civil enmities, must have caused a larger contamination of Hebrew pedigrees than before, till the pride of birth in those who resisted fusion, and boasted to be 'Hebrews of the Hebrews,'¹ was inflated into a haughty

¹ It ought not to be forgotten that the Mosaic prohibition extended only to intermarriage with those Canaanitish nations who are always spoken of as doomed

fanaticism, which, presuming itself to be born in righteousness, a child of grace, claimed a place on the highest round of the patriarch's ladder reaching from heaven to earth.

It is probably superfluous to inquire into the historical development of the synagogue and the Sanhedrin from its earliest germ. When brought into contact with the great thinkers of the Eastern world, amidst the profound peace of imperial Babylon, the more active minds among the Jews would certainly be driven to examine the wisdom which, so long neglected, lay hidden in the bosom of their nation. The captives, too, were the *élite* of their own people; and the advancement of some illustrious members of their body to high office would facilitate the admission of any who wished it, to converse with that class of state soothsayers who, whilst they professed the secrets of the invisible world, held a high rank and wielded vast influence in the visible. Those Jews who lived near enough to the focus of empire would be struck by the manner in which the supernatural penetrated the political element there; and, remembering that they had an oracle divinely given to organize a commonwealth, and to be, in fact, the inward life by which it performed its outward functions, would be led to feel the overpowering duty of studying the law of God, meditating therein, and elaborating knowledge to a discipline of perfection. Study and converse would ripen each other; and we find in the prophet Daniel, in his evident searching of the written text of Mosaic Scripture, and in his close intimacy with the grandees of Chaldaean mysticism, traces of a character which gave its tone to a large portion of the subsequent history of the Jews on its better side. In Ezra we have a man moulded as a vessel of the same Spirit, but apparently with a different function, and one which worked more on the ordinary level of human agency; but whether we watch the mystic and the seer, or the zealous priest of a repentant nation, seeking to elaborate their 'fruits meet for repentance,' there is the same anxious eye in both to what had been written as the ultimate standard of appeal in matters of obedience. We cannot but suppose that considerable progress had been made in the study of the law by the people—such study, at any rate, as earnest meditation, when brought to bear on oral instruction, would amount to. If, indeed, we compare the expressions used in Scripture on the occasion of the public reading of the Book of the Law, when newly found,

racés, and not to heathens generally. Ezra had (ix. 1) added 'Egyptians' to the list, as also 'Moabites' and Ammonites.' It is clear, however, that Pharisaism extended the prohibition to all races of men.

by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 2, 3), with the similar proceeding under Ezra (viii. 1—3, 5, 6, 8, 9), we cannot but be struck with the utter absence in the former account of any proof of sympathy or intelligence on the part of the audience; whereas the latter narrative teems with significant allusions to the devout and earnest reception of the Divine record by the people. 'The people stood to the covenant,' which the king made in his and their name to keep the law, is all we read in the Book of Kings; and this seems to signify the mere unthinking acquiescence of a multitude who had not yet been educated up to the occasion. The reception of the readings of Ezra is a proof that the study of the law had taken hold on the popular mind. Not, of course, that the thousands who listened were imbued with the zealous spirit of Scribes and Levites; but there was an interest in all, and a larger or smaller degree of knowledge in most. Whether there had been in Babylon small detached gatherings of the more zealous students of the Testament given by God to their fathers, is a question which can never be settled. If there had been, in proportion as they obtained regularity and method, they would approximate to what was afterwards the type of the synagogue. It is, at any rate, plain that from the time of Ezra that type must have rapidly approached its completed form; and probably in less than half a century an organized system of public teaching was diffused throughout Judæa.

Nor, whilst considering the gradual growth of the popular study of the law, should we omit to notice the formation of a class of men called by a name in reference to the most important function of that study—'scribes.' In the formal language of the decree of Artaxerxes, Ezra is called 'the scribe of the law of the God of Heaven,' (vii. 12—21.) We read (2 Chron. xxxiv. 13) that in the reign of Josiah there 'were of the Levites, scribes, officers, and porters;' but the word there probably denotes generally any function for which writing was necessary, and does not yet acquire the peculiar tinge of meaning which in the New Testament it uniformly bears. It seems clear, then, that there was a class of men called 'scribes' already existing at the period of the return; and although among them all the Levites were probably included, yet whosoever was ardent in the study of the law might also be of the same class. In short, the term 'scribe' seems to denote the transition of the written law from a dead *depositum*, rather guarded than used, to a speculative source of thought and practical fund of principles, and to mark the period when the law came out into the conscious life of all who wished to be accounted children of Abraham. From this period

dates the Rabbinical maxim, that 'the crown of royalty in Judah 'was in abeyance, the crown of the priesthood was with Aaron's 'seed, but the crown of the law was common to all Israel.' From this period, the character of a perfect scribe, expanded into that of a traditionist, became the most influential among the Jews, as all other elements of established authority became weak. The high-priesthood fell gradually into contempt, as the office became the object of corrupt intrigue with every successive protector, conqueror, or persecutor of Judæa. The royal power grew from a moderate chieftainship under Simon, the last brother of Judas Maccabeus, into a domestic tyranny under Jannai, and thence lapsed into a hateful foreign usurpation under Herod. As the high-priesthood grew despised, and the royalty hated, the popular crown, that of the law, flourished, and its votaries abounded.

Nor was the high-priesthood the only point of the old constitution which grew weak; there is a great question as we chase shadows in the mist which pervades Jewish history, what became of the once great influence of the tribe of Levi? The number of Levites who returned from captivity is represented as inconceivably small,—about three hundred and fifty only, not reckoning the 'Nethinim' and 'Solomon's servants,'—whereas the priests amount to over four thousand. Even in the time of Josiah they would seem, from one passage¹ to have been only about double the number of the priests. In the prophetic writings the name of Levite rarely occurs; and, if we except those of Malachi, where its prominence is remarkable, only in passages whose scope may be rather supposed to be Messianic, and their fulfilment referable to the Christian Church. The probability, if we may venture a suggestion, is, that the tithes of two tribes only was a maintenance insufficient for those who had before enjoyed the tithes of twelve, and thus that, when the Levites from the ten tribes took shelter in the kingdom of Judah, they either became ministers of the high-place worship, or ceased to retain any religious distinction. Accordingly, when, under the zealous Josiah, their scandalous occupation was swept away, they would not be allowed to retain any honours or share any emoluments of the Levitical office; and, under the ravages of the Chaldeans, which scoured the country up to the gates of the capital, they were probably in great numbers beggared and starved. Further, it seems on the whole not impossible, that, whereas the priests could not properly discharge themselves of their duty anywhere but in Jerusalem, and, therefore, the majority of the priests would probably return,

¹ 2 Chron. xxxv. 8, 9.

many Levites, on the contrary, perhaps the majority, might remain in the countries of the dispersion in order that the great and rapidly-increasing numbers of Jews in those parts might not be destitute of religious teaching. But be this as it may, there is the fact, that the Levites were at the return very few, and yet that Ezra's administration clearly recognised the Levites as an integral part of the constitution, whilst Nehemiah is copious in his statement of their duties and privileges. We learn, however, from Malachi that the Levites became corrupt, and that the payment of tithes was evaded (ii. 4—9, iii. 3, 8—11), and the decline of their influence, which is thus indicated, certainly progressed. A new and popular class, the 'scribes,' gradually embraced and absorbed the official privileges of the more exclusive class of Levites; and the more so, as Pharisaism, involving the steady advance of traditional observance, overlaid and obscured the claims of the written law. Together with the latter, the claims of the Levites, its keepers, became gradually depreciated under the influence of tradition. And although the tribe of Levi may have budded anew, and the Temple-service must always have employed a certain proportion of its members, that discharge of sacred routine left them in a position of importance relatively far below that which they held in the Mosaic constitution, as the authorized expounders of the law. The busy mental life of the synagogue and the Sanhedrin absorbed the vigorous intellect of the nation, and the sons of Levi in these pursuits had, after a few generations, merely an even chance of distinction among their brethren. Accordingly we find, in the later Judaic development, that the great Rabbis were not of any one tribe, nor of that of Levi more than any other. The study of traditions becoming gradually more and more enormous in its pretensions, threw its shadow not only over the written law, but over the real centre of the nation's spiritual life, its sacrifices and typical atonements. Thus the Levites suffered in both their relations. No doubt Rabbinism obtained its latest dimensions after those sacrifices had finally ceased; but it exerted a depreciating influence upon them during at least the last century before that cessation; and beneath the same tendency, in its less active stage, the Levites proper, except those who were musicians and singers, appear to have gradually sunk into a position somewhat analogous to that occupied in earlier history by the 'Nethinim'

¹ The Nethinim mingle in the later fortunes of the tribe of Levi, whose drudges they at first were, but with whom they seem ultimately to have blended. These Nethinim are the same as the Gibeonites, of whom Joshua made a sort of sacred helots. At first despised, and by Saul persecuted, they had, when the Tabernacle removed to Mount Zion, and still more when the Temple was built,

and 'Solomon's servants,' with whom probably, at the New Testament period, their fusion was complete.

On one occasion only in the New Testament history are Levites mentioned as taking part in a public transaction; that on which the Jews sent 'priests and Levites from Jerusalem' to inquire into the pretensions of the new teacher beyond Jordan; and the notice of those time-honoured titles, in their familiar juxta-position, recalls us for a moment to the olden period,—the heroic age of the chosen nation, whose last eventful crisis began in that 'voice crying in the wilderness.' But from all the public relations of Judæa the Levites' influence had passed away; and when Herod propounded his question 'Where Christ should be born?' it was addressed—and the style is significant—to the 'chief-priests and scribes of the people.' This latter was the class which had diverted the ancestral reverence of the nation for the sacred tribe. That tribe still officially existed; but their office was lowered and shared by others. Its genealogies were perhaps uncorrupted; but genealogy had ceased to be politically important.

The Hebrew name for scribe is *Sopher*; and this name, in its plural form, *Sopherim*, is given to a catena of sages, reaching from the time of Ezra, who, with his contemporary and proximate prophets, was reckoned among their number, to that

a fixed residence and public maintenance within the walls of Jerusalem. These became immensely valuable privileges when the open country was swept by invading armies, as in the latter days of the pre-Babylonian monarchy it constantly was, and the importance of the Nethinim rose accordingly. Their name, which means 'given,' was probably an allusion to Josh. ix. 27, where Joshua is said to have 'given' them (margin) to serve the sanctuary, and probably grew from a term of reproach to one of honourable distinction. Yet there is much question whether it was in general use before the Captivity. The course of time gradually fused down nearly all distinction between the Levites, the Nethinim, and 'Solomon's servants,' i. e. the remnant of the strangers of the land, whom he reduced to a helot state (2 Chron. ii. 18), and who were also regarded as in some measure sacred—a striking proof of the official sanctity which tinged every public institution—although there is no record, nor any likelihood, of an oath taken to spare them. Josephus mentions a request of the Levites who were engaged in the musical service of the Temple to King Agrippa, to be allowed to wear the priests' ephod—a direct breach of the law, as he notices (Antiq. xxviii. 6); and also a request of those Levites who merely helped in the other work of the Temple, to be allowed to learn the chaunts. This of itself illustrates the extent to which the popular importance and esteem of the sacrificial duties had declined. In another place (De Bell. Jud. II. xv. 4), he remarkably omits to mention Levites where the passage would seem to require it. We have there the priest and the *ἱερείας* distinguished as well as the musicians and singers, but no Levites as such. The *ἱερείας* of John vii. 32, 45, and xviii. 3, are clearly the same class of whom Josephus speaks in that place. Perhaps the musicians and singers might have been pure Levites; but it is far more likely that natural qualifications prevailed in such appointments, and that the mass of Temple ministrants, in which Levites and the other two classes were blended, furnished them. The chief thing to observe is, that office, and not lineage, became the leading idea. In post-Babylonian history the name Gibeonite merely means 'man of Gibeon,' e.g. Neh. iii. 7.

of Simon the Just, who ceased to be high-priest, B.C. 291. During this period of about a century and a half, the strong feeling of the nation towards the realization of the institutions of Moses, at first so whole and undivided, had begun gradually to feel the diluting influence of Greek notions which the conquests of Alexander diffused over Western Asia. From their intercourse with that most subtle and insinuating of races, a large or, at least, influential section of the Jewish mind began imperceptibly to relax the intensity of its devotion to the fixed rule of their own law and the severe cast of its manners; and, as usual, with minds of another inward temperament, that Greek influence operated only to deepen the root of their patriotic tendencies, and concentrate its direction. This law of attraction and repulsion seems one common to all such schools of thought, or moral and spiritual systems, as rise to an ascendancy over the human mind when brought in contact with other schools and other systems. The philosophy of Epicurus, rather than of Plato or Zeno, seems to have early fastened a hold on the minds of western Asiatics, probably because it was not only the most generally popular, but the most easily corruptible into a philosophic apology for voluptuousness. As their submission to the Syro-Greek empire brought the Jews of Palestine more fully under the influence of their Syrian or Greek neighbours, so it induced colonies of Jews to settle, under the bribe of large privileges, in the Syro-Greek cities, and planted some new towns of Greek settlers within the limits of Palestine. Thus the attractions of external philosophy and fashion were close around and in the midst of them,—the tree of forbidden fruit, as it were, shooting its boughs amidst the tree of life. The Jews in Antioch and its dependent or neighbouring towns, were known as the worst of their race by their Judean brethren. The first marked development of Pharisaism is when it stands out in opposition to these debasing fashions; for indeed it was in its fashions of life, refined under the sensuous glow of a Syrian climate, that Græcism was influential with those whom its philosophy could not move. To the orthodox Jew his fashions were prescribed; and the public bath with its relaxing associations, the palestra with its physical excitement, and, above all, the orgies or revel-worship of the Greek, were fenced off from him by his ritualistic code, and were repugnant to the spirit of separation which it engendered. Now, just as the gay dissipation of the looser cavaliers provoked the morbid severity of the Puritans, so the creature-life of dissipation roused the Pharisaic tendencies of the Jewish mind to a more severe recoil. We have seen how post-Babylonian Judaism contained in itself the seeds of Pharisaism; and

how, as the law, dogmatizing, as it was meant to do, on the details of every-day life, became a living principle in the bosom of the nation, in the scribes that principle found its personal expression. Ezra, his associates and successors, acquired a lead over the mind of the people which was knit up with the principles of national existence, and wrought itself deeply into the tenacity of the national character. Hence the men of 'the Great Synagogue,' as this school of scribes or Sopherim were called with veneration by later generations, went on educating their nation up to a point gradually more and more divergent from that to which the external tendencies of the age were pressing; and when, under the reign of Epiphanes, those tendencies assumed the form of intolerance and persecution, the remnant of orthodox Judaism, though scanty, yet powerful under compression, threw itself at once into the patriot ranks which rallied round the standard of the Maccabees. But we must not forget that, on the internal relations of the nation, the Sopherim developed a similarly powerful influence. Indirectly they tended to limit the political importance of the priesthood, weakened as that body was, in its practical bearings on the national life, by that gradual decay of the Levites, as a tribe and an order, to which we have already adverted. Dr. Raphall is, no doubt, correct in representing the Persian monarchy as opposed to 'municipal governments,' although we venture to doubt whether the diminished importance, or rather political¹ extinction, of the house of David was due to that policy. Whether or no the high-priests lost tangible influence through their being the great king's tax-farmers, it is not easy to say; but it is clear that a void was left in the national sympathies with their exalted functions; and that mainly for two reasons, a negative and a positive one. Firstly, they were no longer, as in the olden time, the vicars of autocratic Deity, and the oracular declarers of his will in a public crisis; but, as we have said, the *publicani* of a human and an alien ruler. Secondly, there had sprung up within the nation a devout conviction that the covenant of the law was the heritage of God's people; and although this conviction became full of the harshness of the letter, as the living voice of inspiration died away, yet the people at large, under the teaching of the scribes, felt that their own functions, as regarded the law, had a living fulfilment, while they had to look back to a vanished age for a similar recognition of the high-priest's.

¹ Yet the fact that the posterity of Hillel, who was of the seed of David, enjoyed for several generations the presidency of the Rabbinical school, has been alleged on the opposite side; perhaps it is but an instance of the strong hereditary tendency of all fixed institutions.

Nor was this the whole of the alteration which affected the moral identity of the nation. As we take leave of the reverential multitude, standing before their great Scribe with that volume of the book open to their hearts which he was divinely qualified to expound, we are struck by the significant fact, that all to the external eye is there, if not quite as Moses left it, yet more nearly so than it had been for several centuries. Supposing Moses himself represented by Ezra, there were some fragmentary representatives, probably, of every tribe; there were the 'elders and nobles,' or 'chief of the fathers,' no longer banded in a mischievous oligarchy, but heading their tribesmen, and no doubt fulfilling the duty of judges, as in the olden time; there were the priests and some of the Levites, and the high-priest, himself the object of the consolations of prophecy; there, too, were some on whose lips the fire of prophecy glowed still. Such seems to have been the spirit of the revival; to be at last, as near as they could, what God had at first designed them, and to purge off every possible temptation to depart from it. The elements existed, indeed, but the dislocation and mutilation which the body politic had undergone, changed the relation in which they stood to each other and to the whole; and beyond the want of proportion amongst them, there was working under all a new spirit, sure to mould anew from within the whole external fabric, to expand whatever organs were fit for its use, and gradually to shed off from its dominant vitality the incumbrance of whatever was not. This careful restoration of the features of the antique was not instinct with the powers of inward realization; and those features, as in a dissolving view, are lost during the dark ages which intervened, till the tramp of the Macedonian phalanx on the hills of Judæa announced a new era in her history. And as light is again poured across the scene, we find that a wide change has passed upon its spirit.

In order duly to appreciate that change, which is in effect the bridge over the chasm between the Jews of the Old Testament and those of the New, we must remark that the patriarchal system, though some of its massive fragments lingered still, had really lost its power to express and lead the feelings of the restored nation. The mere functions of temporal authority now required a thorough acquaintance with law, and the scribes were the only set of men to whom the people could look for that knowledge. The same knowledge, though presented under a different relation, was required for the people's personal use. A Jew wished now—*i. e.* taking the better sort as the type—to feel his individual support in the promise, and his personal share of the covenant; and that feeling could only be

satisfied by the help of the scribes. Hence jurisdiction and pastoral care, and obviously also the education of persons qualified for office in Church and State, or indeed for the maintenance of the national character in this its new phase, all passed into the hands of the same class of persons; and whether we choose or not to give to these functions, as developed in the first post-Babylonian age, the names of Sanhedrin, Synagogue, and College of Rabbis, there certainly existed the things which grow up historically into those designations. Here then was laid, in the ample and expanding bosom of the people, a broad basis for the constitution in these leading particulars, wholly independent of the exclusiveness of tribe or family. All who had the gift might study, approve themselves, and rise to honour and eminence, as judges, rulers, and teachers. But the change was made under the guiding instinct of the nation itself; and the then leading men, the last patriarchal generation, themselves felt the impulse, and held the position of vantage from which to guide the change they shared. The priests and Levites were of all the best qualified to furnish the class of scribes; and next to them, in opportunity as in eminence, stood those nobles and rulers, or chief of the fathers, whose lineage, pure and lofty, singled them out from the mass of their nation. This is probably why so great a change passed with so little outward show; authority was shared in nearly similar degrees at first by the same individuals, and their body, no longer exclusive, was slowly enriched by the rising merit of the wider mass below. Nor could a development more full of promise have been hoped for, had not the letter gradually choked the spirit, and the study of the law itself become a gradual snare of apostacy from the truth.

We have hitherto reasoned on the broad facts before us, without taking a more microscopic view of detail, nor distinguished in the study of the law the preponderance given to Scripture and to tradition. Tradition at first, as distinguished from Scripture, there could hardly be; the inspired exposition of Ezra becoming at once a late record of Scripture and an early link in the teaching of the scribes. The oral teaching was at first the vehicle of the sense of the law; then a fine envelope of its letter, as what eminent sages had personally taught; then this envelope began to adhere to and to cohere with the sacred text; and, lastly, to gain density and lose transparency, and become a dry and rugged crust, through which oozed but a scanty and altered flavour of the juice within. And, no doubt, a proportion of minds would show a strong and early tendency, a precocity of development towards the traditionist type, which, perhaps, made them marked among their brethren. Hence there

is a consistency with our previous views, in the statement of the Talmud that the *Zadikim*, or those who were content with Scripture, and the *Chasidim*, or those who sought for a more formed and finished system than it supplied, were both found amongst those who returned from Babylon, although any such distinction is inadmissible as marked in the names and parties of that period. The zeal which does not discern how far its own treasured object is universally applicable to mankind, is not confined to any period or nation of men; and there was, no doubt, at the period of the return, an impulse of that zeal widely afloat, and which found still more numerous votaries and more distinct enunciation under the Sopherim. No doubt the Talmudists wished to reckon Ezra and the later prophets among these zealots for tradition, and so to stamp it with divine authority. Under the lax impulses of Græcism, these tendencies would mould themselves into external symbols, and become embodied in parties, both in a measure opposed to the careless views which it favoured. And at the time of the persecution of Epiphanes, the growth of tradition had become definite, and among its adherents were found the most strongly patriotic of the Jews; and when, under the sons of Mattathias, the wonderful stand had been made which secured the freedom, and then for a while the independence, of the nation, the Pharisees, no doubt, were at first the firmest supporters of that temporal power with which a grateful people invested Simon, the last surviving brother of that heroic band. Whether the leaders of public opinion were so hearty when it demanded for him the high-priesthood also, is less clear; but whatever instinctive misgivings may have attended the step, there was nothing manifested at the time but a cheerful and grateful consent. Nor is there any reason to think that the scruples which, more than thirty years later, the Pharisees professed to feel for the title of John Hyrcanus, his son, to both the priestly and the royal dignity, arose from any genuine doubt, as Dr. Raphall considers, whether it was lawful for the same person to combine the supreme temporal and spiritual power. The precedents of Eli the judge, and Jehoiada the regent, sufficed to settle any such question. But what else was the entire system, which we have been tracing as unfolded under the Sopherim, save such a combination? That is, indeed, the whole system's conservative feature, the one in which it was true to the idea of the olden constitution of Israel under Moses and Samuel, that the fabric of temporal and spiritual power should in every joint be intertwined. We can understand how a Jew, writing in the meridian glow of transatlantic liberty, and wishing to ingratiate himself with the leaders of popular feeling in a young republic, should denounce

such a combination as a 'departure from the law of God and the usage of Israel' (Raphall, vol. ii. p. 99); although, at the same time, it is curious that he should have stated on the very page before (ibid. p. 98), that 'as the functions of judge and magistrate were open to every Israelite, the high-priest, as such, was likewise not excluded from performing them.' Nay it is manifest, that the very fact of the Sopherim combining in themselves those three functions which, blending civil with spiritual power, found their final shape in the Sanhedrin, the Synagogue, and the School of Theology, was the very reason which filled them with instinctive jealousy of a powerful individual, whose combination of civil and sacred functions was fast growing into a title of dynastic legitimacy. The displacement of the patriarchal by what, for want of a better name, we may call the *scholastic* system, went, as we have seen, quietly enough; but it was a very different thing when that system, verging in the Pharisees to its extreme, and becoming instinctively intolerant, saw a powerful monarchy, professing a popular principle as its basis, springing up to control, by the power of the executive, the moral and political influence of the Scribes. It was precisely because both the sacerdotal monarchy and the Sanhedrin contained the same elements of temporal and spiritual power, that they felt themselves natural enemies to each other; and in that feeling, as it gradually gained the ascendancy, all the seeds of disunion which ruined the nation were gradually sown and ripened.

We must next notice how the supreme Sanhedrin, or court of seventy at Jerusalem, consisted of Scribes, or men learned in the law; and how, while it furnished rulers and teachers, and, in short, all the official staff of the synagogue from its own body, and from other similar and subordinate ones, it recruited those bodies from the scholars, who always sat in twenty-three rows, facing the judges, during the time of the exposition of the law. That there were other elementary schools of study need hardly be stated; but it curiously illustrates the close intertwining of the temporal and the spiritual element, to find that the same place which was a court of law was also at the same time a divinity school, and that the hearing cases adjudicated was a later stage of instruction in religious knowledge. The very same person, in fact, Simon the Just, already mentioned, filled the three offices of high-priest, chief rabbi in divinity, and nasi or prince of the Sanhedrin. In later times these were never united, although the two latter occasionally were; and when the Romans at last made the high-priesthood a matter of venal patronage, it was found necessary for the Sanhedrin to pass regulations providing for an illiterate person's discharging

the routine of necessary duty without any gross breach of external propriety. Thus the high-priest was not latterly, we are told, even a member, *ex officio*, of the Sanhedrin; although it is difficult to understand many of the scenes before the council, as the New Testament represents them, especially that in Acts xxiii., as otherwise than presided over by the high-priest.

Yet this scholastic constitution, with its narrow bookworm spirit, had, in spite of its popular basis, an inherent weakness, especially when any of the difficulties of government threw it into temporary collision with the people whose voice it generally expressed. It was no nursery for men of popular abilities;¹ there was a withering recluse air which hung about the divan of sages, and kept out those broad draughts of human sympathy which animate a court of the real delegates of the people. The union of the court and the school tended to make judges pedantic and dogmatists inflexible, but gave no scope for the vigorous practical faculties, which find their open sphere amidst the current of human passions and feelings without doors. Hence, as the oppressions of Rome became more rigorous, and public impatience under them increased, that 'fear of the people' of which we hear so much in the New Testament, was a constantly acting motive in the council chamber. This is, indeed, one of the public features of the times, which, important as it is, but for the New Testament Scriptures we should never have known. The power of the council, so far shattered already, was never repaired, and rode uneasily at anchor, moored as it were by a thread, upon the turbulent bosom of public feeling, until all statesmanship, law, and order, broke adrift together in the final chaos of Jewish history. Frequently as these chief-priests and elders of the people were successful in suborning public tumults, we do not remember an instance of their success in appeasing one. At last, amidst the shattered resources of their oppressed nation, the impulses of popular fury were the only means at their command to retaliate on and alarm the insolent enemy; and they, the rulers of a nation professing the only pure law, became powerless save to evoke, direct, and concentrate the violence of the Jerusalem rabble, to control which was impossible. We have seen how the Pharisees became a large and popular party, the natural offspring of that wide-spread root, the power of the Sopherim, or Scribes. In them a strong solution, so to speak, of Sopheristic principles saturated the national

¹ Josephus is the only clear exception to this rule; he certainly had popular abilities and great shrewdness of judgment in affairs; and there is every reason for thinking that he doubted rather the capacity of the chief men to lead than the zeal, energy, and resources of the people in following.

mind. Under the later Asmonean princes, however, we have also seen how Pharisaism became antagonistic to that dynasty, in whose later members Sadducean tendencies strongly predominated. At that period, Sadducees found their way into the Sanhedrin, although traditions state that it was purged of them by a simple test,—that of the knowledge of the law, in which they were grossly deficient. Herod affected to favour the Pharisees, that he might seem to be a popular and national sovereign. The 'leaven of Herod' implies a party which had lost sight of distinctive religious principles in political time-serving. On the whole, however, the Pharisees, with a few exceptions, acquiesced with sullen duplicity in his sway. There is a strong appearance of Pharisaic predominance in the Sanhedrin of the Gospels, with a partial reaction in that of the Acts in favour of the Sadducees. The constant recurrence of the expression 'Scribes and Pharisees,' shows how complete was the identity of interest between them; nor, perhaps, is their ubiquitousness the least important feature of their public character. (See Luke v. 17, 30.) The same threefold institution—the Sanhedrin, the Synagogue, and the School—was organized throughout the land; and, wherever a sufficient number of families were resident together, this group of provincial institutions, with subordinate relations to the metropolitan one, sprang up. Accordingly, throughout both Judæa and Galilee, we find that they were never far from our blessed Lord when engaged in his public teaching. In the corn-fields where the disciples plucked the way-side ears, there were some of the fraternity to mark them. In the publican's house, detested as its owner was for his occupation's sake, they had cognisance of our Lord's being a guest; while of all matters in the synagogue and the temple they had, of course, instant information. Josephus has a remark on their maintaining intercourse with each other; and, throughout the New Testament, they seem well acquainted with the tactics of party. We cannot admit Dr. Raphall's theory, which identifies the Chasidim or Assideans of the period of the Maccabean war with the Pharisees. Those *Chasidim* appear to have been a set of fanatics, who carried to an extreme every view which regarded the independence of their nation, and the purity of the means by which it was to be attained and preserved. Most probably they were the same as the Essenes of Josephus, and had nurtured in retirement their

¹ We never hear of the 'Scribes and Sadducees' together, although members of the Sanhedrin must have been Sadducees sometimes; but it was the full character of knowing, teaching, and judicially applying the law, not the mere function of judging, which constituted the 'Scribe.' Compare our Lord's expression of a 'Scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven.' Matt. xiii. 52.

deep zeal for the law, until the moment when the call to arms *pro aris et focis* drew them to the banner of the Maccabees. The rage of the Syrian generals was especially directed to effect their extermination; but to exterminate such men is not possible, least of all in a chronic state of civil war in which religious feelings are strongly blended. Many of them were probably to be found later, debased by the evil influences of the time, among the ranks of the Zealots. As violence became gradually the only means of carrying out their principles, they lost all purity of thought, and retained only the unrelenting ferocity of warfare with which patriotism inspires the desperate; and with it mingled a monstrous capacity for atrocious crimes, which has never been surpassed.

It is necessary to trace the gradual formation of the Sadducean party. It is to be accounted for by the contagion of Greek manners and philosophy, and, no doubt, by a weariness in some minds of the punctilious burdens of Pharisaism. The severe vicissitudes of persecution under Epiphanes, and tyranny under the dynasty founded by the deliverers from that persecution, both tended to detach minds of a roving, worldly tone from the traditionist party. Yet respectability would force them to keep up some profession of compliance with Moses' law, although they would not fail to adopt its minimum of observance. Intellectual and speculative men, who fret at any barrier in the way of their mind's development, would resent the Pharisaic attempt to clog and chain their erratic flights, and would, under the profession of Sadduceism, find a convenient screen for a wider renunciation at heart of what was popularly held sacred than they were themselves perhaps conscious of, or at any rate than it was politic to avow. Men of pleasure, too, whether animal or intellectual voluptuaries, would gladly take refuge under a name which it was not a manifest hypocrisy to assume, as it would have been to call themselves Pharisees. The purely negative character, which was the sole qualification of the sect, thus enabled many men of various views to range themselves under it. Hence there was no active bond of sympathy, no watchword of party, no excitement of popular championship, possible among them. Josephus,¹ who, it must be allowed, was not a man of warm sympathies with any party, and so far a candid judge of all, intimates that they were rude and distant as well to each other as to those who were not of their own persuasion; a statement inconsistent with the strong party cohesion which alone gives strength in factious times. Their severity in punishments, when they held the office of judges, as it probably found most scope for its exercise amongst political

¹ De Bell. Jud. II. viii. 14.

offenders, would be sure to stamp them with odium in a nation which, of all except the great classical homes of freedom, was the most remarkable for independence of political sentiment. The political Sadducees are the most important variety, and their period of chief influence lasts from the time when the Asmonean dynasty was firmly established until it had decayed into the factions which brought the Romans in as umpires; and of the political Sadducees, Prideaux and others consider the Herodians as a branch. That the Pharisees as a body were opposed to whatever power trenching on native independence, is clear; nevertheless there were individuals of eminence of that party who, at any rate at one time, favoured Herod's claims. Such were Hillel and Shammai, certainly not Sadducees, the only two of the Sanhedrin who, when he with the aid of Sosius, Pompey's lieutenant, took Jerusalem, were spared, and that in consequence of their having, like Jeremiah in the Chaldean siege, counselled a surrender. The name 'Herodian' implied a stigma, and continued to be applied, when Judæa was a province under a procurator, to all who countenanced submission to Roman authority, whatever their religious views might be. No doubt the Sadducean tenets were most easily reconcilable with that submission; and this again tended to keep alive popular feeling against that sect, which was only powerful from the individual influence of its members, and was by the necessity of the case without collective weight in public affairs. Indeed Josephus¹ asserts with great probability in his favour, that if ever they acquired any public function, the Sadducees were obliged to adopt Pharisaic measures for the time, to make themselves tolerable to the people. This characteristic of trimming to the times is an especial stamp of the Sadducees. They assumed a modified Gracism when the current of the times set that way; they opened their arms to Hyrcanus the First, when the pertinacious purism of the rival sect threw him upon unpopular support; and abetted the tyrannical cruelty of Alexander Jannæus, when he became an Oriental despot. Being mostly men of rank and wealth, and probably resident in the capital, as well as in constant intercourse with all the tools of foreign power, they were able to exercise a powerful check upon the Sanhedrin from without, although they rarely after the death of Jannæus commanded a majority in its counsels. Beyond the limits of Judæa, where latitude of opinion, owing to the closer contact of foreign ideas, was more prevalent, they hardly challenge notice as a sect, and after the final capture of Jerusalem they easily disappear. Their political importance ceased

¹ *Antiq. Jud.* XVIII. i. 4.

when the Roman sword had settled the question of independence, and their cold and negative theology was swept away in the advance of Rabbinism, unless it may be supposed to be represented in the modern Karaite Jews.

There are two striking occasions, besides one of lesser note, in the later history of the Jews, on which a serious proposal was made to return from royalty to the ancestral form of government, under which designation the proposers of that return wished to be understood the supremacy of the Sanhedrin and Scribes, with the high-priest as a sort of *princeps civitatis*, such as had prevailed before the long embarrassments which succeeded the persecution of Epiphanes. To Pompey, when at Damascus he presided as umpire over the embroiled inheritance of the Maccabees, the first proposal of the kind was addressed. The Pharisaic party were no doubt the main holders of this view; but for Pompey to allow it would have left a native government too strong in the affections of the governed to suit the policy of Rome. Again, when Augustus Cæsar received at Rome the Jewish deputation, petitioning for *αὐτονομία* without royalty, and for their country's annexation to the province of Syria, against the claim of Archelaus to succeed his father Herod, we cannot help feeling that the heart of the Jewish people spoke out in that request.¹ On the earlier occasion, the partisanship for each of the two sons of Jannæus prevented any united demonstration in support of such sentiments, and there was a deputy pleading with Pompey for each of them, as well as a legation in behalf of the old *régime*. It is quite in keeping with our previous suggestions, that the Scribes should have, as a body, held aloof from either of the candidates for monarchy, since whichever of them were successful the priestly and royal power would be, in fact or in effect, in the same hands; and of this, as we have seen, the great Pharisaic party had a natural jealousy. This seems to indicate a temporary detachment of the Pharisees under the last Asmonean princes from the broad popular party; and no doubt the influence of an active and powerful monarch must needs be to centre round the throne, and not round any group of rival institutions, the affections of the people. Thus at the end of the reign of Jannæus, his widow, a discreet princess, (save that the Pharisees took on themselves the direction of her conscience, and, through that,

¹ The third and less important occasion was when a legation was sent to Antony in Syria by the Jews, consisting of a hundred men in positions of chief authority, to deprecate the maintenance of Herod and Phasaël in power by the arms of Rome. The feeble Hyrcanus II. in whose name they governed, was appealed to by Antony, and decided in favour of the man who afterwards dethroned, exiled, lured back to Judæa, and at last judicially murdered him.—Joseph. De Bell. Jud. I. xii. 5—7.

of the realm,) was enabled to govern for nine years with more tranquillity on the whole than had befallen her kingdom in the time of her husband, or than was experienced afterwards under her sons. The Pharisees became at this time the court party, and the Sadducees, had they been qualified for it, might have led the popular cause. The priests probably had felt that the union of the high-priesthood with the royalty in one person had a peculiar weight of oppressiveness for them; there is moreover great probability that Sadduceism, under court influence, had spread widely among the priesthood during the previous reign; and, while the former motive led them to desert Hyrcanus' cause, who was already high-priest, the latter drew them to the side of Aristobulus. So far had the usual bonds of party broken adrift, under the disorganizing influence of an *imperium in imperio*, that the Pharisees, who usually included the majority of the priests, and were the wonted leaders of the people, were now detached from both, and finding that, alike under Hyrcanus or his brother, the state influence which they had wielded through the queen regent was likely to vanish, formed a 'constitutional' party by themselves, while the people stood on the side of legitimacy in the elder brother Hyrcanus, and while the priests and Sadducees, content to allow him the high-priesthood, conspired to place Aristobulus his brother on the throne.

When, however, seventy years afterwards, they confronted Archelaus before the tribunal of Augustus, the Pharisee chiefs had long since resumed their place as popular leaders. The sufferings of many of their number under Herod for the cause of national independence had enabled them to keep up a desultory irritation against his government, though it was too strong to be seriously disturbed. No form of royalty was likely to be acceptable to the people, now that the Asmonean royal house had fallen, one by one, the victims of dynastic jealousy. Archelaus indeed was the heir of a double hatred, that towards his tyrant father and his Samaritan mother; no wonder, therefore, that the general mass of the Jews looked back fondly from the prospect of such a serpent-knotted sceptre to the revered memory of the 'men of the Great Synagogue,' and longed for the more popular government of the olden time, when the High Priest and the Sanhedrin divided the allegiance of the land.

The tendencies of the 'constitutional' party, as those of all innate Hebrew institutions, were no doubt aristocratic. Whether Pharisee or Sadducee ruled the scale of public affairs for the moment, the course of events for the last century B.C. had engendered an aristocracy of mingled wealth and birth, without distinctive rank or titles, save in respect of the priesthood, and with political influence based on the discharge of high

public offices. The constant mention, in nearly the same relation, by Josephus, of *οἱ ἄριστοι, οἱ ἐν τέλει, οἱ δύναντοι, οἱ εὐγένηις*, shows that at the time when the Romans obtained a virtual supremacy over the affairs of Judæa, the preeminence of mere intellectual merit was greatly modified. The torpid administration of Persia had made itself felt, as a general rule, only in taxation; the Syro-Greek monarchy had attempted religious oppression, and the result had been the independence of Judæa; but the power of Rome sat more closely to its beast of burden, the province, and by prostituting justice, legalized oppression in all the details of life, while it professed to offer protection. In the face of such active engines of oppression as Roman provincial usage furnished, the scholastic government of the Sanhedrin was powerless, and could only retain respect by mingling its influence with that power of wealth and rank which has been described. The Sanhedrin also, though self-elected, seems to have had a preference, at least *cæteris paribus*, for well-born candidates; besides which, it tended to create an aristocracy of its own. It is also reasonable to suppose that lucrative offices were in its gift, and that the emoluments of its members were considerable. Thus other influences largely mingled in the thin intellectual bond between the scribe and the disciple of the law, and gave it something of the life-blood of human feelings. One great symptom of such tendencies running into a mischievous oligarchy is, that tradition allowed the law of tithe to be satisfied by a payment of it by an individual layman to *any* priest, which led to the total impoverishment of some of the order, and the inordinate affluence of others. This shows that there must have been some source of powerful influence open to the few who thus enriched themselves, and probably indicates intrigue or malversation of public office; although it may have been nothing more than the facility which a rich man always has of becoming richer. The effect of Herod's policy in public munificence and otherwise, was to gather round his palace and under his power all who were likely to influence their nation. And the effect of the repeated lesson of failure in every attempt to baffle his vigilance and escape his vengeance, must have been to make the leading men wait in trembling despair for his death, and in the meanwhile, whatever their theological views, affect Herodianism. Having reduced them to this abject state, although now and then a conspiracy was detected, or a public outrage savagely punished, he could easily plunder by extortions any number whose treasures it was more easy to confiscate, than to wring taxes from the sullen multitude, or butcher any whose example might keep bright the terrific *prestige* of his power. Thus the state of public affairs at his death was of a very mixed

description. Herodianism must have lost credit and collapsed instantly. The high-priesthood had been studiously degraded too long for it to offer a rallying-point; the Sanhedrin had been too completely stripped of the greater judicial functions, to fill any large space in the public eye; whilst amongst the patriotic party there were individuals doubtless of much influence, but there was no organization ready on the moment, nor any one man of high name and great powers to command public confidence. After a nominal reign of nine years, amidst tumult and disaffection, Archelaus was exiled, and the rule of the procurators was more tolerable to the leading men who had a position to lose by public uproar, and to whom the temptation became every day stronger to lend their influence to government, by tightening their country's chains. 'The Pharisees,' we know, 'were covetous;' and amidst the terrible perils of a fresh struggle, they might think peace at any price the only policy for those who wished to die rich, although publicly in the Temple they would have shown a pious horror, if the question, 'Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar?' were answered in the affirmative. In enumerating the various social elements in Judæa, we ought not to omit notice of a *γένος βασιλικόν*, several times mentioned by Josephus, who were probably divers remote branches of the same priestly house to which the Asmoneans belonged, and were called the 'royal house' for that connexion's sake, although not ranking above the other priestly aristocracy. They mingled among those persons called *εὐγένεις*, a massacre of whom to the extent of twelve thousand was perpetrated by the Zealots on their first mastering Jerusalem. These 'nobles' were odious through their influencing public affairs in favour of order, and their large number seems to show that it was a settled thing for men of noble birth to reside chiefly in Jerusalem, where no doubt they shared the emoluments of office or intrigue. Thus, although wealth, family, and personal influence could powerfully affect the course of public affairs, the only recognised constitutional powers lay in the High Priest and Sanhedrin. The inherent weakness of a government which existed mainly to expound the law, conspired with the goading cruelty of the Romans to make men despair of all government, domestic or foreign. Hence they fell back on the state and the rights of nature; and a popular fury which renounced all law, when men discovered that the only law really operative was one which ensured their wrongs, seized on the masses of the people. Meanwhile the intellectual few were split into Pharisee and Sadducee, with the cross-division of Herodian veining both parties; and the Pharisees were split again into the faction of Hillel and the faction of Shammai, whose unscholastic wranglings came

now and then to the rough logic of fist and cudgel, like those of the Scotists and Thomists of a later day.

About the time that this dry discord ran highest, the Sanhedrin lost, or, as the Mishnaic writers say, surrendered their capital jurisdiction; and clearly, in the state of restless disturbance swelling everywhere to a head, no power which had lost the sovereignty of the sword could make itself respected. Capital punishments, accordingly, the power of which must rest somewhere, lay with the Romans; and by consequence every such infliction, however just, became a new outrage on national dignity, and provoked a fresh provocation. Thus incensed patriots could construe a judicial murder out of even the most upright execution of criminal law. And while these feeble casuists of the letter were splitting hairs in the council-chamber, 'blood was touching blood' without. The impatience of the people to feel their hand on the sword gave rise to the bands of Zealots, who, full of explosive courage, but utterly without union, subordination, or self-control, speedily drove the weak government to a confessed anarchy, and lavished in idle wantonness of feud or of revelry the sinews which might have kept the siege at bay, and the provisions which might have sustained it. At once, on the death of Herod, and the relief from the weight of his stern hand on the sceptre, this tendency to riot in the name of God and law had become rife among the more distant provinces. Nor is there much doubt that the Galilean robbers, whom long before he had seized in their dizzy caves between earth and heaven, belonged to the same class of misguided patriots. But, indeed, in such bosoms nothing save the animal part of that patriotism which had inspired the Maccabee with victory, was left. The Attila of the moment gathered his horde about him, whose subsistence was the plunder of their country, though their object might be the damage of the Roman; but the rural ravages of such bands were nothing as compared to their atrocities when they threw themselves into the city. It is sufficient for our purpose to trace the formation of this fearful element in Jewish society; its crimes it would be idle here to repeat; they form one of the darkest blots on the history of the world.

Whilst, however, the main roads were tolerably secure, at any rate for travellers in large bodies, the presence of the adult males in Jerusalem, on three great occasions in the year, caused a circulation of the thought and feeling of the country on a scale which no ancient nation ever knew. The recurring sight also of the concourse of foreign Jews from all countries would stimulate national confidence by the homage of all the nations of the civilized world. It has been observed by the witnesses of those

pilgrimages to Judæa of which the world is not weary yet, that the romantic effect of distance on the imagination is seen in the great number of these votaries who come from the remotest seats. It is morally certain that the same influence operated in the Apostolic age, and the intense concentration of feeling with which devout Israelites at home met on holy ground their far-off kin from east and west, the many diversities of speech and manners setting off and interpreting the unity of spirit amongst all, is what no other age or race of men can ever see. At the same time, the want of a common language amongst a great number, and the brevity of the sojourn of many, would prevent any preponderance of the foreign over the home element, and keep the balance of exchange in the market of opinion steadily in favour of Judæa. Nor should we wholly omit the considerations of secondary importance, that the constant radiation of traffic, during many months of the year, to and fro between Jerusalem and its wide spiritual dependencies, must have given a great impulse to communication in general, and caused a regular flood-tide of demand in every market of the area so traversed. The ancient solemnities of concourse, by which the Greeks in early times had kept up the self-consciousness of race and nation, could never at their best estate have rivalled the vast Pan-Judaic festival; much less could the physical excitement of the athlete, or even the æsthetic stimulus of the stage, have approached the moral magnetism of that confluence which, without spectacle or pomp, poured in to keep the rite of fifteen hundred years. It can hardly have failed, however, that there was a harsh line drawn across society at the point where poverty disabled men from sharing the privilege. Mitigated as it may to some extent have been by the lively play of home and kindred charity which such occasions call forth, this must yet have existed. It is clear, however, from the Gospel narratives, that persons of humble station and slender means managed to make the journey from the distance of Galilee; and the constant interruptions to transit, through the unsettled state of the country, would cause the attendance in more favourable years to considerably exceed the average. When all this is taken into account, it gives us no mean opinion of the advanced state of police and economic regulations that so little of the misery of overcrowding is traceable in the copious accounts which have come down to us. Considering the vast concourse thither in some of the hottest months in the year, it would seem astonishing that there should not have been some sweeping instances of pestilence amidst the swarms of human beings seething under the fervour of religious enthusiasm, were it not reasonable to suppose that the Great Author and Object of their worship

Himself, 'kept the city,' so long as it was His will to receive preferential worship there. It is true that these seasons caused some trepidation on behalf of the public peace to the Roman governor and garrison, and that they were often turned to account by Samaritan, Jew, or Roman, as occasions of mutual irritation. But when we consider how keen the exasperation was among them, the average tranquillity of Jerusalem at Passover, under Herod the Great, will bear favourable comparison with the frantic riots of modern Christians at the Holy Sepulchre, as described in several most trustworthy of recent authorities. But besides these scriptural solemnities of the Holy Seasons, tradition, or the narrow interpretations of the traditional school, tended to increase the importance of the capital, and give a sanctity to its very pavements and walls.

Thus Dr. Raphall, who on such a point is probably trustworthy, states (vol. ii. p. 388, note) 'that the Talmud, in rigid adherence to the letter of the law, "the place which the Lord thy God shall choose," (Deut. xvii. 8, 10,) lays down that the *jus gladii* is inseparable from the Temple of the Lord; and that, if the judges sit in any other locality, they have not the right to sentence and execute a culprit. The Sanhedrin usually held its sittings in the *Lishkath Hagazis*, "stone portico," within the precincts of the Temple; and to divest themselves of the duty of convicting capitally, the members of the Sanhedrin had but to remove their sitting to some locality not forming part of the Temple.' So we learn from Dr. Edersheim (p. 171), that a father 'came to the capital for the purpose of formally disinheriting' his son, apparently implying that the civil process in question would otherwise have been invalid.

On the pitiful casuistry which would thus evade the most sacred duty of the commonwealth, and pick a quibble from Holy Scripture to shelter its evasion, we will not further dwell than to say that it exemplifies fairly, as far as we can judge, the spirit of the Sanhedrin and of its descendants. Dr. Raphall holds that the supreme magistracy of the land might blamelessly abjure its most solemn functions by removing across a street. Who shall say that the 'varnished Pharisees' (vol. ii. p. 117), the tithers of anise and cummin, between whom and the respected patriots whom he admires the modern Rabbi would draw so clear a line, have not their representatives at the present day, and that the law of God and its solemn duties is not still set at naught by those who inherit 'the traditions of the elders?'

This consideration gives additional importance, nay, it adds a modern interest, to the gradual tendency of Jewish theology under the influence of the Scribes. We have so far traced that

influence chiefly in its political bearings, but it is impossible to leave the subject there. The prophet Malachi left his nation under the reproach of laxity in those very observances, for their mischievous minuteness in enforcing which their leaders of opinion in a later age were notorious. Hence we have no positive statements of Holy Writ to guide us in tracing the germ of Pharisaism as it began to open. To the elements of fact, and to the more subtle intimation of a tendency in them traceable in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, attention has already been called. But as the means of study became more and more diffused, the law settled more and more deeply into the minds of the people, and a steadily-increasing proportion of intellectual activity became gradually devoted to it. It is easy to account for the strong temptations to the exclusive study of the letter which beset the Jewish mind, but it is strange indeed to observe the way in which that tendency, unresisted, won a gradual triumph over the inward dictates of feeling and conscience, and ended by a nice rigour of duty in everything, without a single ruling moral principle in anything—in acts of lavish beneficence done with a hardened heart. So imperceptible was the decline, and so strict the band of habit gradually formed, that the successive schools of doctors never once seem to have felt any qualm of conscience, or heart-question stirring them within, till they had bound on the backs of their nation of disciples the whole burden of traditions. Amongst the tendencies to the exclusive study of the letter, we may notice, firstly, the greatness of Moses, who was the giver of the law, as distinct from later prophets who left other writings. The intensely spiritual tone of a large portion of prophecy might have tempered the study of the letter, but for the secondary estimation in which, to aggrandise the lawgiver, the prophets were popularly held. Secondly, the law itself largely consisted of prohibitive precepts, in interpreting and applying which practically a closer adherence to the letter is probably allowable. Thirdly, the office of judge, exercised often on matters of minute detail, was associated with, or bore the closest relations to, that of theological professor, and beyond the office of a theological professorship, the lines of duty for a spiritual guide were not clearly drawn. Thus the theology became cramped by the narrow spirit of interpretation, which has been the besetting sin of a keenly legal mind in probably every age of thriving jurisprudence; and the narrowing theology thus imbibed was not tempered by any refreshing influence of the affections aroused by the pastoral office. Fourthly, it is, perhaps, not too much to assert that the universal spirit of the ancient world was literalism. How many heathen oracles are recorded as triumphantly satisfied in the letter? How many of the solemn forms of

classical republicanism ran in the fixed grooves of verbal expression? We should not be far wrong in saying that the servile adherence to the letter is a badge of human nature wherever its tendencies come fully into play. Of all these causes here suggested—and more probably might occur—the one which appears to have operated with the most continuous and evident influence is the third. The habit of the jurist's mind was to multiply, classify, and subdivide precepts artificially—to arrange in heads and sections rather than to refer to principles. Precepts so dealt with—and the law as given by Moses is largely preceptive—tend to be viewed by the mind in an attitude of externality, rather as mere weights laid on from without to steady the moral machine, than as suggesting those inward forms of proportion and order by virtue of which it remains self-balanced. Thus the principle of obedience is weakened, and the action of the moral heart cramped by over-straitness of external lacing, which merely preserves the form of compliance. And when this point has once been reached, the moral development is so far stunted, that henceforth precepts become, in a secondary sense, necessary; for, as the pupil has been deprived of the inward power of feeling whereon obedience hangs, the teacher must thenceforward set up a fresh system of props from without, and answer with a new precept every question of casuistry.

These new precepts were at first, perhaps, direct logical deductions from Scripture, or resulted from tracing more or less remote analogies; but, as many of the cases thus provided with rules might be morally as important as those for which rules were found in the letter of Scripture, a plausible reason appeared for assuming the rule which the scribe's wisdom had deduced, or his ingenuity extracted, to be of as binding a nature as the text of Scripture itself. The reflex action of this process on the personal importance of the teacher himself, would tend strongly to develop such a system of precepts. Here then was the ball of tradition set rolling, nor was it easy to interrupt the law of its course. In traditionalism, indeed, is found the only proper vent and issue of literalism. It is not easy to conceive of the latter continuing for two successive generations without some tendencies towards the former.

No state of human society, indeed, has ever been free from the cunning rascality which enjoys all or nearly all of the selfish fruits of transgressing the law, at the same time that, owing to the weakness of human preventives, it evades the penalty of transgression. It is clear, also, that an ingenuity basely perverted to master legal subtleties, confers a power of doing wickedness, which may, owing to circumstances, far surpass a more daring criminality. Now, since it is the instinct, as it is

the interest of society, to check at any rate those crimes which plainly lead to its own disorganization, no such vicious subtlety can, on civil points, affect it far. But men in the mass may set themselves to deal with the Divine law, at any rate in those points which have no obvious bearing upon temporal advantage, in the same spirit as that in which the cunning baffle of human justice deals with a statute. And something very close to this seems to have been the view which the Scribes and Pharisees took of the law of Moses; although, from the full mass of guilty evasion to which this spirit of quibble might commit them, there were contained in tradition itself, perhaps, certain safeguards in some particulars. But to the entire moral bathos to which that spirit presiding in *foro conscientiae* must lead, they stood fully committed; and even to many violations of natural morality, which might revolt the conscience of a heathen of no extraordinary enlightenment. Thus the hateful associations which a Christian connects with the name 'Korban,' could never be felt for any merely heathen outrages of the moral sense. It is the heavenly sacredness of the whole apparatus of sinning which makes the sin so hateful, and which stands as the crucial instance, perhaps; out of all the history of mankind, how *corruptio optimi fit pessima*; or, in more sacred words than those of human proverb, 'if the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!'

Such was the result of removing from the province of the heart the principles regulative of human conduct, and resting that conduct on an external fence of precepts. It made knowledge of more importance than love, and ingenuity the most influential over the mind of all the organs of knowledge. Thus, while the moral temper was lowered, the standard of acuteness was raised; and at last that obedience alone was declared acceptable before God, which consisted of the scholastic operation of the intellect. The study of the law was that to which the kingdom of heaven was, in their view, open. Hillel 'the Great' may be viewed as the person in whom the fruits of literalism, as ripened in tradition, were first harvested. His long life and protracted career of public eminence gave him an authority which, in his own day, outshone competition, however his contemporary Shammai may have divided with him the suffrages of posterity. To him is ascribed the first attempt to arrange under six heads those traditions which had previously been dispersed in six hundred sections; and in his labours the Mishna, as a codified system of tradition, may be said to have begun. The following precepts have been ascribed to him:— 'Whoever does not increase in learning decreaseth. Whoever does not acquire knowledge becomes guilty.' 'Say not *when I shall have leisure I will study*, for, perhaps, thou mayest never

'have that leisure.' Again, 'An ignorant man cannot properly abhor sin; a peasant cannot be pious.' The second of these seems to almost parody the words of Scripture on active benevolence in favour of that knowledge which was the Rabbi's crown. 'Say not unto thy neighbour,' says the wise king, 'go and come again, and to-morrow I will give; when thou hast it by thee,' (Prov. iii. 28); while the third exactly matches the spirit of trampling contempt which speaks in the words of the Pharisees, reviling the witness of an unsophisticated conscience to the teaching of truth; 'This people' (imperfectly rendered, rather, 'crowd,'¹ or 'rabble,') 'who knoweth not the law are cursed,' (John vii. 49). 'Hillel,' says Dr. Edersheim, 'may be singled out as the man who gave its peculiar tone to the religious thinking, not only of his own period, but to that of Jewish theology in general. This period was (*i. e.* from about 32 B.C. to 8 A.D.) the golden age of Talmudism.' His learning 'was celebrated in hyperbolic language. It was said to have embraced not only Scripture and tradition, but languages,² geography, and natural history—in fact, all sciences, human and superhuman. To show the extent of his influence upon the rising generation, it is asserted that Hillel had no less than 1,000 pupils, of whom eighty were said to have been specially distinguished. . . . He also originated some changes in the management of the theological schools, and was the first to introduce the distinctive titles of Rabban, Rabbi, and Rab; the latter being applied to extra-Palestinian teachers.' Of Hillel's eighty pupils, 'thirty were, in the language of the time, described as worthy that the Divine glory should rest upon them as it did upon Moses: thirty, that at their command the sun should stand still in the firmament, as in the case of Joshua.' The spirit of Hillel then was the guiding *animus* of the Jewish presbytery, when its leaders stirred up the people to demand the crucifixion of our blessed Lord. These satellites of Hillel, flattered by posterity as the peers of Joshua and Moses, were, no doubt, among those who answered the judicial interrogative, 'What think ye?' of Caiaphas, with the awful words, 'He is guilty of death,' and who invoked on themselves and on their children the weight of that innocent blood. Gamaliel, indeed, the same of whom we read Acts v. 34, was the pupil and grandson of the Jewish father of sages. He was a man of views liberalized by the contact of Christianity, the

¹ ὄχλος.

² This marks the details of the statement as suspicious; Jews of that period are known to have entertained a contempt for the study of foreign languages, παρ' ἡμῶν γὰρ οὐκ ἐκείνους ἀποδέχονται τοὺς πολλῶν ἔθνων διάλεκτον ἐκμάθοντας.—Joseph. Antiq. XX. 10. 2.

atmosphere of which he inhaled, yet without receiving the life of its truth into his heart.

In illustration of his character, we may quote the following remarks of Dr. Edersheim:—

‘Trifling as it may appear to us, such indulgences as having a figure carved upon his seal, bathing at Ptolemais in a place where a statue of Venus had been placed, and in general displaying a taste for the beautiful in nature and art, were serious innovations to a Pharisaical Jew. Gamaliel’s descent, position, and influence alone could protect him in such a course of conduct; and later writers have felt it necessary to frame certain excuses for those apparent deviations from strict rabbinical principles.’—P. 143.

No doubt Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, as well as the human teacher of Paul and Barnabas, ere they became direct pupils of the Holy Spirit, had both drunk of the same narrow rivulets of teaching, Hillel and Shammai. The former is indeed mentioned in the Talmud ‘as one of the three wealthiest men in Jerusalem.’ (Ibid. p. 144.) From what has been already said, as indeed from the general tenor of the New Testament, it may be assumed that the Sadducees had but little provincial influence. Whereas the ‘Scribes and Pharisees’ cross our Lord’s path everywhere within the limits of Judæa and Galilee, the Sadducees meet him only in the latter part of his public ministry as it converges towards the capital, where its last tremendous scenes were laid. They naturally kept aloof from the popular ministry of the synagogue, which, as far as we can trace it, seems to have lain everywhere in the hands of the opposite sect, who ruled opinion among the lower orders, and by their teaching fostered the intense sentiment of nationality till it broke wildly free from all leading in tumultuous outrage. The separateness and hallowed preeminence of Israel, fixed by the law as a barrier against surrounding Gentile corruptions, became a fierce text of insurrection when the hated power of the alien checked national spirit at every turn. The outlying districts of Upper Galilee, Peræa, and the Trachonitis, as they never felt the security of law, had never learnt to submit to its restraints. The unsettled life of borderers renders them everywhere the last whom civilization reclaims; but more especially those borderers of Judæa, who lay upon its desert outskirts, felt the wild attraction of nomad independence a constant temptation, whilst the *razzia* of disciplined troops was only an occasional restraint. More especially, when they saw all the interior of their country groaning under the oppressive presence of the alien, and marked how that oppression lay heaviest of all on the capital itself, they would congratulate themselves as the chosen remnant whom God had reserved, with knees and necks unbended to the abomination, which made spiritually desolate the

rest of the land. Soon they grew to despise those weaker brethren on whom the yoke had settled, to scorn them as apostates, and hate them as traitorous surrenderers of the sacred liberty of God's people; and soon, whoever would not join the band of the Zealots might justly be the Zealots' prey. Thus every basest animal impulse, lust, cupidity, revenge, and that thirst for blood which, when bloodshed becomes the direct means to the indulgence of other passions, soon grows into a distinct passion of itself, were let loose to revel, as it was thought, in the service of God. How must the sleek and wealthy members of the aristocracy in the capital, living at their ease, and sacrificing within the sound of the clash of the swords of the Roman garrison, have provoked the fiery hatred of these lawless patriots! We have already mentioned how they, in an advanced stage of public disorganization, like a disease which progresses from the extremities till at last it seizes on the heart, won their way to the capital, entered and occupied it, and at once began a massacre of the noblest men there; and on the whole there seems little doubt that, had any accidental diversion removed the forces of Rome from the scene, the nation would have been plunged in direct civil war, and the desolating strife of armed factions have been the slower means of national ruin. As it was, however, the sword of the Zealot raging against priest and scribe plays only a secondary, though still a fearful part, in this tragedy of the nations, and the frenzy of dissension mangled the body politic of Judæa, till life was impossible, whilst the Roman executioner was planting deliberately his mortal blow.

- ART. IV.—1. *Histoire de l'Eglise de France, composée sur les Documents originaux et authentiques.* Par L'ABBÉ GUETTÉE, Tomes 12. Paris: Jules Renouard et Cie., Rue de Tournou, 6. 1854.
2. *Supplément aux Décrets du Concile de la Province de Bordeaux, célébré à la Rochelle en 1853, et publié en 1855; ou, Défense de l'Histoire de l'Eglise de France contre les Imputations contenues dans ces Décrets.* Par L'ABBÉ GUETTÉE.
3. *L'Observateur Catholique: Revue des Sciences ecclésiastiques et des Faits religieux.* No. 1—23.
4. *Correspondance des Confesseurs de la Foi relativement au nouveau Dogme de l'Immaculée Conception.* 1855.
5. *Lettres Parisiennes; ou, Discussion sur les deux Liturgies, Parisienne et Romaine.* Deuxième Edition. Paris: Danton; Huet. 1855.

THE publications which we have grouped together form, more or less, a proof of the renewed struggle between Gallicanism and the Ultramontane tenets which, till lately, have seemed to hold undivided sway in France. Twenty years ago it almost appeared as if the four famous Articles of 1682, as if the truths for which Bossuet wrote, and acted, and suffered, had been utterly forgotten. All the earnest religion of France was Ultramontane. Under the dynasty of the Orleans family, the old views of the established Gallican Church were simply impossible; and we have seen in the later years of Louis Philippe a member of the Chamber of Deputies, in referring to some abuse in the arrangement of a church, declaring that he only happened to be there on the occasion of a marriage.

It appears, however, that beneath the Ultramontane surface, there was a deep working of the old principles, which was destined to bear fruit in due season. And within the last ten years, from every part of France, evidence has been given that the tenets of Gerson and Bossuet were only dormant, not extinct; and the exertions of the Abbé Laborde, of Lectoure, in opposition to the Bull *Ineffabilis*, manifested to Europe that struggle between the two parties in France, which has now attained such proportions as to threaten the disruption of the entire Gallican Church.

The history of the Church of France, which stands first in our list, is undoubtedly the greatest literary effort of the revived

party. To quote the author's own preface, 'Baronius in his ecclesiastical annals has not forgotten the *fairest province* of the kingdom of JESUS CHRIST; Bollandus and the Bollandists, Noël Alexander, Sirmond, Baluze, D'Achery, Martene, De Sainte Marthe, Tillemont, Bouquet, Mabillon, Rivet, Pagi, Ruinart, and many other learned men whom we might name, have reproduced its monuments, or discussed the obscurest points of its history; Lecointe has compiled its annals. Finally, Longueval took in hand his "*Histoire de l'Eglise Gallicane*," continued by Fontenoy, Brumoy, and Berthier, until the middle of the sixteenth century. I respect,' continues the author, 'the work of these learned Jesuits. It has been of the greatest utility to myself, and it is a duty, therefore, to proclaim my obligations. Nevertheless, I think that something more perfect may now be expected. The history of the Gallican Church has undergone the fate of the greater part of human productions; perfect, perhaps, for the time in which it was written, it is no longer in harmony with the taste of the present day; questions of Christian art, liturgy, and philosophy, ecclesiastical and monastic laws, are not treated as they now should be with the development which modern history has presented to us.'

The history of this history is in itself worth relating. Abbé Guettée's work is comprised in twelve large octavo volumes. Published successively, they attracted from their very commencement considerable attention, and were received with general applause. Prefixed to the third volume is a dedication to Monseigneur Fabre des Essarts, Bishop of Blois, (March 15th, 1848,) accepted by that prelate with the attestation that from his own knowledge of the already published portion, and from the reports of certain priests to whom he entrusted its examination, he was convinced of the conscientious care expended on the author's researches, the exactness of his doctrine, and the good spirit of the whole work. The sixth volume is ushered in by a still more emphatic approbation by his eminence De la Tour d'Auvergne-Lauraguais, Cardinal-Bishop of Arras. 'This history,' writes that prelate, 'is an everlasting monument to the glory of the Gallican Church. By its help greater light will be thrown over the annals of the eldest daughter of the Catholic Church. . . . We have no hesitation in recommending it to the Clergy of our Diocese.' This approbation is of the 28th of May, 1850. A prefatory notice, however, which ushers in the same volume, shows that the author was already suspected of those Gallican principles, then, as now, so offensive in high places. He contents himself in replying to the question, 'Are you Gallican or Ultramontane?' by requesting his readers to suspend their judgment till the history should have reached that epoch

in which the opposing principles came into collision (the volume in question embraces from 1226 to 1351), and briefly asserts, 'Nous déclarerons purement et simplement que nous sommes avec les Ultramontains sur certaines questions et avec les Gallicans sur d'autres.' The preface to the seventh volume (June 1st, 1851) shows that Ultramontane writers were vigorously attacking its author; and finally, on the 22d of January, 1852, the 'History of the Church of France' was put in the Index of prohibited books. On learning this, not by a formal intimation, but merely through the medium of the 'Augsburg Gazette,' our author addressed a letter to Monseigneur Garibaldi, papal nuncio in France, requesting to be informed whether the intelligence was authentic. By that authority he was referred to Rome, and accordingly wrote to Cardinal Brignole, president of the Congregation of the Index, to solicit further information.

'As a priest devoted to the Church,' it is thus that he expresses himself, 'I could not but be deeply afflicted in finding that I was classed, without any previous notice, by a Roman Congregation, among the writers whose orthodoxy the faithful are more or less enjoined to suspect. I know not on what motives the Congregation of the Index can have based its censure; for I can see nothing in my work which is not capable of a perfectly orthodox sense.' He concludes by requesting to be furnished with the document on which the censure was founded—in order to profit by the observations therein contained, and thus 'to make the book irreproachable.' The reply was to this effect: That it was not the custom of the Congregation in question to communicate the pieces on which its decisions were based; that the author should address himself to learned and orthodox ecclesiastics of his own nation; and after adopting the corrections which they might propose, should submit his revised work to the Congregation. The Abbé forthwith addressed himself accordingly to four prelates, who either declined the proposed examination, or coupled it with conditions to which the author found it impossible to submit. He again applied to Rome, with the reasonable observation that in order to correct his errors, it was necessary to be informed of them; and that his own efforts having failed in France, he now trusted to be furnished with the memoir for which he had previously applied. The answer was the same; the Congregation never communicated such documents, and the author must apply to other critics. He accordingly inserted a notice in the succeeding volume, that he should be thankful for any criticisms whatever; and this done, applied himself to the completion of his work.

In the eleventh volume, which contains the history of the Jansenist struggles, and of the four famous Gallican Articles of

1682, the author proceeds to far greater lengths than he had ventured at the commencement of his work. To this and the twelfth volume we shall presently direct the reader's attention at some length.

Matters were however brought to a head by the Council of the Province of Bordeaux, which assembled at La Rochelle in 1853. Under the presidency of his Eminence Cardinal Donnet, Archbishop of Bordeaux, it was composed of the Bishops of La Rochelle, Périgueux, Agen, Luçon, Poitiers, Angoulême, Martinique, Guadeloupe, and S. Denis de la Réunion. The sixth and seventh sections of the first chapter are thus expressed :—

'We declare that without scandal and injury to souls, and without insult to, and contempt of, the Holy See, it is impossible to use the expressions which are constantly employed by some with respect to the Roman Congregations, and more especially with respect to the Congregation of the Index; namely, that its decrees, approved by the sovereign pontiff, are of no value and no weight; a temerity happily contradicted in our day by the conscience of the faithful.

* * * * *

'For this reason we are astonished at, and deeply lament, the blindness of spirit which has possessed the author of a work entitled "A History of the Church of France, composed from original and authentic documents;" who in the eighth volume of his history not only renews, but aggravates, the erroneous statements of the seven first, condemned by decree of the sacred Congregation of the Index.

'*Paying no regard to the admonitions of pastoral charity*, making vain efforts to defend his faults, he repeats the same thing here and there, that is to say :—

'That the sovereign pontiffs have overstepped their rights; that, only desirous of governing, they have wished to attribute to themselves all ecclesiastical power; that they have not made Concordats for the good of the Church, but for their own interest, which Concordats could only injure religion; and, as the temporal power has too often invaded the sacred rights of the Church, that the sovereign pontiffs have strengthened these impious usurpations with a canonical sanction by means of the Concordats; that they have thus created modern Gallicanism, or rather that they have consecrated it by a kind of baptism; finally, he dares to affirm that the right even of making Concordats derives its origin from the sovereign pontiffs' desire of domination, and that it is entirely foreign to the power which has been divinely given to them. It is needless to recal the other errors of the same writer on the authority of the sovereign pontiff, liturgical right, religious orders, and vocal prayers; on the guilty abandonment of ancient discipline, still more, on the change in ancient doctrine, of which he complains *in an impious manner*. Let it suffice to notice his bitter zeal, his malevolent spirit, his want of feeling for the ignominy of his spiritual fathers, his love of insulting them; his injustice towards the good and the friends of the Church; always favourable to its enemies, always willingly and easily sacrificing historical fidelity to their known calumnies.'

The decrees of the Council, though held, as we have said, in 1853, were not published till June 3d, 1855; and the Abbé Guettée lost no time in putting forth the pamphlet which stands

second on our list. He undertakes to establish, and does establish, the following propositions ; that the Council of La Rochelle had judged him without giving him an opportunity of defending himself ; and that of the ten bishops who censured his eighth volume, two only had opened it ; and even these two professed to have read but a portion of it. He then defends himself against the particular charges brought forward in the decree of the Council, especially that of his partiality to heretics, by which title, as he shows, the Port-Royalists are intended.

Among the journals which most powerfully undertook the Abbé Guettée's defence, the '*Observateur Catholique*' more particularly signalized itself. This review was established in the October of last year for the support of Gallican principles, and to oppose 'the pernicious tendencies of the party which finds its organ in the "*Univers*."'

'Depuis assez longtemps ce journal a seul la parole. Il a abusé de sa publicité pour répandre dans le monde catholique de nombreuses erreurs ; et, ce qui est plus déplorable encore, il a prêché ces erreurs au nom de l'Eglise et du Saint-Siège. Il nous a semblé qu'il était bien temps de prendre, contre cet organe exagéré de l'ultramontanisme, la défense des vrais principes catholiques. On finirait par identifier l'Eglise avec son école, si des catholiques sincères n'élevaient pas la voix pour rappeler que l'ultramontanisme ne fut jamais qu'un système rejeté par tout ce que l'Eglise a possédé de plus nobles intelligences ; et qu'en voulant transformer en dogme ce système faux, anti-catholique et anti-social, le parti ultramontain veut nous imposer un joug que la foi aussi bien que la raison repoussent.'

From the very commencement the nerve and vigour of the new periodical gave it considerable influence ; and in order to be thoroughly independent it was determined that the contributors should be laymen only. The law by which contributors to periodicals are compelled to attach their names to their articles, would have exposed any priest who might write in the pages of the '*Observateur*' to serious trouble, and, therefore, where a paper is received from an ecclesiastic, one of the committee of directors makes himself responsible for its contents. The introductory article, which develops the scheme of the paper, is from the pen of M. Guélon, one of the ablest and most frequent contributors. MM. Eugène Secretant, Parent Duchatelet, and Virey, are also in the same rank.

In addition to reviews, theological dissertations, and notices of books, each number contains a *Chronique Religieuse*, which to a foreign reader is its most entertaining part. If any one is desirous of learning the lengths to which French Ultramontanism is pushing the worship of S. Mary, he can hardly find a better study than this chronicle. It must be confessed that there is here and there a bitterness which is scarcely suited to a religious periodical ; but the constant and unscrupulous attacks of the

'Univers' are but likely to provoke a reply in its own strain. Some of these notices may interest our readers:—

'We have received a pamphlet containing the act of Consecration to the Blessed Virgin, pronounced April 4, 1855, by Cardinal Gousset, at Rheims. We remark in it the following passage:—"We are happy to be able on this day, on occasion of a ceremony so august and so consoling to our heart, to renew, on the faith of an oath, the vow which we long ago made, to teach and to defend the privilege which has made thee holy, more holy than holiness itself, from the first instant of thy conception." 'Holiness, (remarks the editor,) 'considered generally, is God Himself, who is essential holiness. Are we to conclude that Monseigneur Gousset regards the Blessed Virgin as holier than God Himself?'

'A preacher, in his sermon of the 16th of December, delivered in his church in this city, informed his astonished auditors that "perfect contrition is an easy thing, much easier than is generally imagined. Think of the enormity of your crimes and of the goodness of God—and you have perfect contrition and are justified. To say that perfect contrition is not an easy thing, is a monstrosity; it is to turn a religion of love into an impracticable religion. A hundred thousand sins! it is nothing in the world. One moment's repentance, and all is blotted out!" O Father Pichon,' (exclaims the editor,) 'verily you have fervent disciples.'

'Much speculation has lately been excited by a journal called the "Rosary of Mary." The number which is in our hands is that of Saturday, January 19th, 1856....We especially notice an article which contains such blasphemies as the following:—"You who fear the face of Jehovah, who tremble when the hour of prayer to Him has arrived, pray to Mary with the faith of our fathers, and she will lay your wants before the Divinity; for it is by Mary that the incense of prayer ascends to the throne of God; it is by Mary that the virtue of grace, and the ineffable blessings of the Most High descend." Thus Mary is better, so far as we are concerned, than God; God is deprived of the infinite goodness which is His essential attribute; Mary takes the place of Jesus Christ as the Mediator between God and man. That no doubt may remain on the subject, we read as the motto of the "Rosary"—*All by Mary: nothing except by Mary.* This unfortunate magazine has recourse to simony in order to procure subscribers; for, at the head of the number which we hold in our hands, appears the following notice in bad Latin:—"Priests who will promise to send us twenty-eight intentions in the space of six months, will receive our journal gratis for a year, reckoning from the day of their promise." Subscriptions to a newspaper is a temporal object. To pay for it by masses is to apply to a temporal object a thing which in its very nature is spiritual. This traffic is, then, simoniacal; for, says the Canon Law, simony is committed by giving, or even by promising, the temporal for the spiritual, or the spiritual for the temporal, as principal end and object, and not gratuitously.'

And here is another notice of a French abuse which will apply with equal force to some of our own fashionable churches, at least at watering-places:—

'The Archbishop of Paris has just forbidden the clergy of his diocese to advertise in the newspapers the names of the artistes who have promised to sing in their churches. It was time to put a stop to this scandal; for it seemed that our churches were about to rival the opera. It is to be hoped, then, that there will be an end to the demand of three francs for a chair, as at the Mass of the Holy Innocents in the Church of S. Francis; or one

franc, as in the Madeleine. Under similar circumstances, the countryman showed his good sense when he said, "If you demand this sum for my chair, well and good, but then I shall carry it away with me at the end of the service; for I could buy it at the same price!" Let us hope that the order which has just emanated from the Archbishop will put an end to the quantity of profane music which has been daily increasing, to the great sorrow of true Catholics.'

It may easily be conceived that a journal with such principles as the above, would direct its attention to three points connected with the present state of the Church of France—the so-called miracle of La Salette, the Bull *Ineffabilis*, and the substitution now taking place in Paris and other dioceses of the Roman for the Gallican Missals and Breviaries. The two former subjects are so intimately connected with the life—there have not been wanting those who have whispered also with the *death*—of the Abbé Laborde, that a short notice of that distinguished writer may not be out of place.

Jean-Joseph Laborde was born at Lectoure, a town which was a stronghold of so-called Jansenism in the eighteenth century, and which seems to have retained the same bias in the present. First curate of S. Mary at Auch, and then incumbent of a country parish in the same diocese, he distinguished himself by his 'Censure of Twenty-two Propositions of corrupt Morality, extracted from the Writings of a modern Author:' which 'modern author,' M. Gousset—seeing that corrupted morality is no obstacle to high places—subsequently became, what he still is, Cardinal-Archbishop of Rheims. For this censure our author was compelled by his own diocesan, the Archbishop of Auch, to apologise to M. Gousset. He took care, however, to do so in a manner perfectly intelligible to the latter, and followed up his first work with three discourses on the subject of relaxed morals. At this time the Abbé Guéranger's work, 'Institutions Liturgiques,' written on the most determined Ultramontane principles, was exciting great interest in France. Laborde composed in reply to it his 'Lettres Parisiennes,' a second edition of which has lately appeared. And, as the question of the Immaculate Conception was now everywhere discussed preparatory to its definition as an article of faith, our writer came forward with his 'La Croyance à l'Immaculée Conception, ne peut devenir un dogme de foi,' which was denounced to the Congregation of the Index by Mons. Lacroix. The condemnation which followed, insisted on by the Archbishop, but constantly declared by the priest, on the principles of Bossuet and Fleury, to be of no value whatever in France, led to the retirement of Laborde from his diocese and his settlement at Paris. He here occupied himself in a defence of the Gallican Church against the attacks of Count Montalembert. When it was understood

that the decree exalting the dogma of the Immaculate Conception into an article of faith was to be pronounced in Rome, on the festival of the Conception, 1854, our author was despatched by his friends to memorialize Pius IX. on the subject. On his arrival at Rome, he was arrested by the police, detained prisoner on board the vessel *S. Pierre* for some days, and then reconducted to France. He here published an interesting relation of his journey; and employed the intervals of ease in his last sickness (which almost immediately attacked him) by the composition of his last work, '*Entretiens sur la Salette.*' At his own earnest desire he was taken into a hospital for the poor, and there, after having received the last sacraments, he died on the 16th of April, 1855, in the fiftieth year of his age. The most atrocious calumnies were promulgated as to his last moments; but the friends who had assisted at his death-bed came forward in the pages of the '*Observateur*,' and did justice to an end which worthily crowned a life spent in the service of God.

We are not about to enter into a discussion of the miracle of La Salette, which we have already noticed on a former occasion. The Abbé Laborde, in his '*Entretiens sur La Salette*,' demonstrated, as far as it is possible to prove a negative, the utter groundlessness and incredibility of the whole relation. He argues that, in order to establish a miracle, the very highest degree of evidence is requisite; that Canon Law forbids the reception of any evidence before an ecclesiastical tribunal without the solemnity of an oath; and that the same law declares children under the age of fourteen incapable of taking an oath. Of the two so-called witnesses of the apparition of the Blessed Virgin, Maximin Giraud was only eleven, and Françoise Melanie Mathieu was not fifteen. He goes on to observe that the boy, terrified when he saw the consequences of the invention, confessed to the Curé at Arts that the whole was a fabrication. He further proceeds to demonstrate, from the words put into the mouth of *S. Mary*, that it is impossible to accept the statement, even were the degree of evidence which can be adduced for it tenfold what it is. Such expressions as the following, for example, are dwelt on with much effect. '*If my people will not be converted*'—and observe that throughout the whole of Holy Scripture the solemn expression, *my people*, is employed by God alone—'*I shall be obliged to allow the arm of my Son to fall upon them; it is so mighty and so heavy that I can hold it up no longer.*' Or again: '*I have given you six days in which to work; I have reserved the seventh unto myself; it is not given up to me; it is this which makes the arm of my Son so heavy.*' He comments, as might be expected, on the manifest falsehood, as proved by the event, of the predictions put into the mouth of the appa-

rition. The event occurred in the September of 1846. The words were: 'The potatoes will continue to rot, and this year at Christmas there will be none. Let not him that has corn sow it, for the beasts will eat it; and that which comes into ear, will become dust when you thrash it. There will be a great famine. Before the famine comes, children under the age of seven will fall into convulsions, and will die in the hands of those that hold them.' With the abundant harvest of 1847 before his eyes, the Abbé Laborde may well quote the text, 'When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of them.' How, in the face of these facts, and in opposition to the declaration of the two prelates most interested in the miracle, the Archbishop of Lyons and the Bishop of Gap, an English Roman Catholic bishop can have had the courage to publish an account of his pilgrimage to La Salette, and to profess his unshaken faith in the miracle, is certainly a phenomenon.

We devoted, some time ago, a considerable space to the discussion of the questions connected with the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; without going over our old ground, it may not be without interest to our readers if we notice a few of the facts connected with the subsequent history of the Bull *Ineffabilis*. The Abbé Laborde's open opposition to the dogma, his journey to Rome, and his arrest there, are well known. His 'Relation et Mémoire des Opposants au nouveau Dogme de l'Immaculée Conception,' excited deep interest far beyond the limits of France. One of the most remarkable of his adherents was Father Morgaez, a Dominican, and theological professor at the University of Alcalá. In a letter dated December 19th, 1855, and addressed to Monsieur Laborde, of whose death he was not then aware, the Spanish divine thus expresses himself. After informing his correspondent that his book, under the title of 'Doctrinal Judgment on the Pontifical Decree of December 8th, 1854,' had been suppressed by the civil authority, and that he himself was in danger of undergoing the treatment due to a heretic, he continues thus:—

'Courage, my dear Sir; let us console ourselves in our common tribulations! we suffer them for the holy Church of God, against the profane novelties which are endeavoured to be introduced by men, whom the Apostle has described (2 Tim. iii.), and who, to attain their end, have abused the fervent piety, simplicity and devotion of the holy father Pius IX. towards our tender mother the Virgin Mary, Mother of God. Let us array ourselves in the arms of our warfare; they are not carnal, but mighty in God to overthrow everything that is opposed to them; it is by these arms that we destroy human reasonings, and everything that exalts itself with pride against the knowledge of God. Let us be rooted and grounded in

the faith, and mighty in our works, so that we may refute every doctrine contrary to that which the holy Fathers and their successors have transmitted to us by a perpetual, constant, and uninterrupted succession. Let us oppose ourselves like a wall of brass to the torrent of iniquity, from whatever side it comes. Let us not permit them to brand with heresy the doctrine of the holy Fathers Ambrose, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Emessa, Leo the Great, Gelasius, Gregory the Great, Remigius, Maximus, Venerable Bede, Anselm, Bernard, Erardus, bishop and martyr, Antony of Padua, Bernardin of Sienna, Thomas, Vincent Ferrier, Antoninus, John Damascene, Hugh of S. Victor, and numerous theologians of the ancient school. Let us courageously resist the innovators, and not suffer them to torture, under pretence of explaining, the clear and luminous opinions of the holy Fathers and learned men whom I have named. Let us remain firmly attached to the chair of Peter; but let us not receive blindly everything that may come from Rome . . . I will not write at greater length, because, weakened as I am by age, and by long illness, I cannot spend more time on a letter. I ask one thing from you, my dear brother, and from the companions of our sufferings and afflictions, that you would remember me at the Altar of my Lord, and would beseech Jesus Christ to fill us with power and courage to fight His battles. I would also ask you, if it be possible, to publish this letter in Latin and in French.'

A month later we find the writer thus addressing the Editor of the '*Observateur Catholique*':—

'You know that I have written a work on the same subject of which you treat, and on the same principles; the Pontifical Definition of December 8th, 1854. On this account the Ecclesiastical Vicar of this Court has commenced proceedings against me: they were begun, he said, in order that the Synodal examiners of Toledo might pronounce judgment on my writings. This took place on the 20th November last. The 14th of the following December, I was imprisoned by order of the same vicar, declared suspended from every sacerdotal function, and placed under the guard by direction of a certain priest of this mission of S. Vincent de Paul. I am told that the priest in question, though wearing the habit of a secular ecclesiastic, is in fact a Jesuit. Neither my age of sixty-six years, nor the palsy, from which I have suffered for four, nor the cold of my cell, which is extremely injurious to my health, have prevented the vicar from thus shutting me up. The damp and the cold have aggravated my complaint; I requested to be carried to a hospital, or if that could not be, to be taken to a real prison, where I should be better off; no attention has been paid to my request, and I have received no answer. How could I expect it?—since nowhere else could I be so securely punished, and so completely in the power of spies, as in this house? Here, all are spies and watch me; here, I can neither confess sacramentally, nor receive the support of the blessed Sacraments of the Eucharist, even in lay communion; here, my very name inspires horror; I am regarded as a heretic, a profane person, a blasphemer, a sacrilegious priest; here, as everywhere else, I am reviled before an ignorant people, and in religious houses. If you ask what is the foundation for their attacks, they will only say that the Pope, who is infallible, has promulgated a definition to which an entire obedience is due. They affirm that if he were to command the magistrates to put Father Morgaez to death, they are bound to do so, under pain of rebellion against the Church of God. . . . It is now three months since my work was sent to the Synodal judges at Toledo. No judgment has been given, no sentence has been pronounced, and yet the Clergy cry out with all their strength, that I am a heretic worthy of the fagot and the flames. . . . Would to God,

that when a priest of my order attacked me from the pulpit, and endeavoured to hound on his auditors against me, my life had been sacrificed. I foresee that at my last hour the sacraments of the Church will be refused me, and that my body will not be buried in consecrated ground. . . . Assist me with your prayers, and beseech God to preserve me from the teeth of the lions who surround and watch me continually.'

Another letter, equally touching, but which we forbear to quote, since it has already appeared in a contemporary journal, was addressed by Father Morgaez to the Editors of the '*Observateur*.' In the meantime, he had the satisfaction of receiving a communication from four Italian priests, which must have been a great consolation to the brave old man. It, as well as his reply, have been printed in the '*Correspondence of the Confessors of the Faith*,' which stands on our list. After speaking of the labours and (to human eyes) premature death of Laborde, they thus continue:—

'Besides the priest Laborde, of whom we have spoken with praise, four priests of Pavia opposed the Definition of the 8th of December, 1854, declared to their own bishop that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was quite new, and contrary to apostolical tradition; further, that the definition had been promulgated against all the canons and laws of the Church; so that, bearing upon its face the mark of its condemnation, the divine promises could not be applied to it. These priests, if you wish to know them—if not personally, at least by name and in charity—are none other than ourselves, unworthy and sinners, who desire to be united to you in the bonds of the Holy Spirit. The third day after the publication of the bull, that is to say, the 12th of February last year, we presented an act of opposition to our bishop, who, without examination or judgment, wrote to us that we were under the greater excommunication, pronounced against us by the letters apostolical, and suspended us from all priestly functions; we are still under this sentence, and doubtless shall be till our death. Nevertheless, though we were prevented, on account of the misfortune of the times, from causing our act of opposition to be printed, God took care that it should be divulged, through the French and Italian journals; and, through fear that it should not be hereafter known, Perrone has consecrated its memory by blaming our opposition in the thesis of the new dogma which he has added lately to his theology.

'At the end of last year, Athanasius Donetti, native of the Swiss mountains, formerly a distinguished professor of the seminary of Pavia, and curate in this city, remarkable for his science and eloquence, has published a work to which he has attached his name; in it he has opposed the definition as contrary to right, and proved the perversity of the new dogma, with invincible reasoning, and in an energetic style.

'Finally, Spain has also given her tribute, and it is not small, with regard to the difficulties of the times; for it has furnished from the laity a young advocate whom you have mentioned in your letters, and among the priests—you, who show invincible courage. But you, illustrious confessor, surpass the rest by enduring such shameful treatment for the truth; indeed, words and reasonings are of little use to enkindle faith in the hearts of men, if the divine grace of the Holy Spirit does not come to help and enliven them; but this grace rather works by means of tribulations and sacrifice. For our Redeemer and our Chief has redeemed the world by His cross and by His death; and it was necessary that the grain of wheat

sown in the earth should die, that it might yield, in all the world, an abundant harvest. A similar fate is reserved to His members; thus, those who are chosen by the grace of God to preach the Gospel will not reap in joy, if they sow not in tears; they will not carry their sheaves rejoicing, if they have not planted the seed of truth with tears.

'The merciful God has given you the better part, that of suffering; the more painful the torments you endure for the glory of His Name, the more excellent are they; you are made a spectacle unto the world, unto angels, and to men. You are truly happy, who are persecuted for the sake of justice! The eyes of all the saints are turned towards you; they contemplate the battles of the Lord, and the glorious victories which they obtain through you, against the enemies of the truth. A thousand and thousand times blessed! you represent to our eyes the troop of the ancient confessors of the faith; and in you the army of martyrs reckons a new soldier—that army that shall fight for the faith till the time of Antichrist.

'Take courage, then, courageous champion of Christ, and let not adversity abate your strength of soul. Strengthen yourself in the Lord, and be full of vigour; hold that thou hast, for it is he who shall persevere unto the end that will be saved. And if Satan, our enemy, goeth about, like a roaring lion, seeking to devour you, resist him with the strength which faith gives you, casting all your care upon God, Who careth for you; as Christ has taught, repel all the temptations of the enemy, and strengthen yourself by the word of God. If they will not hear your confession, you need not lay it to heart, since they thus act from hatred to the truth; if the martyr-catechumens were purified by their own blood, you who confess Jesus Christ and His word before men, will be acknowledged by Him before His Father and before His angels. Are you forbidden to say mass? You are yourself the sacrifice, and the altar upon which Christ is sacrificed to God His Father, since you fill up in your body for the Church that which is behindhand in His sufferings. Are you not even consoled by lay communion? Have confidence, brother, in the Lord your God, Who gives the hidden manna to him that overcometh, and who satisfies with the invisible food of angels those who, for not consenting to impiety, are deprived of His body and blood, which are our greatest consolation in this exile. You fear, perhaps, the being deprived of all help in the last combat with death; but remember Christ dying upon the cross, forsaken by His Father; and thus, if men forsake you, you will say with greater confidence, "Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Finally, be not troubled about your burial, when you have before your eyes the examples of so many martyrs whose bodies, cast into the highways, have been torn to pieces by birds of prey, or burnt. . . .

'If you wish to know with certainty the remainder of what has happened to us, and which concerns us, we will willingly relate it to you.

'At the approach of Easter we addressed a respectful letter to our bishop, to pray him at least to allow us lay communion, and to have at least pity upon one among us, who was dangerously ill, and who ardently desired to receive the holy Eucharist. The bishop refused us because we would not betray the truth. The sick man afterwards felt a little better, and lingered during a year a life of weariness and suffering, desiring to die and to be with Christ; but now his illness is increased, and he is on his bed as upon an altar, offering his sacrifice to God, and preparing himself to go to his Lord with great trust, because of the testimony he has given to the truth. Remember him in your prayers.

'Twice our bishop has proposed a conference to discuss the question, and twice has put it off, because we laid down such conditions that the truth might incur no danger, and that the victory might be evidently proved whichever side it might be.

‘Among the priests of our country (we speak particularly of our own and a neighbouring diocese) there are few who believe in their hearts the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; the greater part, before the definition, openly detested it; but afterwards, in presence of the danger, they have obeyed the orders which they have received, from different motives. Some rejected, at least apparently, the opinion which they had formerly supported, and said that they were convinced by the authority of the universal Church, and that they did not wish to risk their salvation by refusing to obey it. The greater number, by privately rejecting the dogma, respect it in public and in the Church, so that the great multitude of the faithful are led by them into this hypocrisy. A very small number regret having acted in this manner; but, through weakness, they cannot raise themselves from their fall. Finally, some, an extremely small number, among those who have no public ministry to fulfil, have not soiled their robes; they lament the silence which is imposed upon them; they pray God to come to their aid if they should one day be called to bear witness to the truth.

‘The faithful are divided into two parties. The one having the appearance of piety, but denying it in reality, blindly embrace the pontifical dogma, refuse to instruct themselves about it, and hold us in abomination as heretics. Others are neither cold nor hot, but lukewarm; therefore they either ridicule the dogma, or they take no more interest in it than in the rest of religion. Nevertheless, through the grace of God, there are still some among the laity—a very small number, we must say—who serve God in spirit and in truth; these detest the perverse dogma, and are ready for anything. We can also mention several women, who, pressed by necessity, have engaged in the combat against the enemy with manly courage, and who for several months have been deprived of Confession and the Eucharist.

‘Alphonse Tenca, priest, aged fifty-two years, latterly spiritual director in the house of the Jeunes-Orphelines. I sign on my bed of suffering.

‘Joseph Grignani, priest, aged forty-six years, lately chaplain in the same house.

‘Joseph Parona, priest, aged forty-seven years, formerly director of studies in the episcopal seminary, and in the last place spiritual director in the pious retreat of penitent women commonly called the House of S. Margaret.

‘Aloysius, priest, aged thirty-one years.

‘Pavia, February 27, 1856.’

But a far more important testimony to the ancient doctrine has been put forward by that persecuted but most courageous Church of Holland, to which we have on more than one occasion called the attention of our readers. It is printed in the ‘*Observateur*’ of September the 1st, and its form and interest induce us to give it entire.

‘**MOST HOLY FATHER,**—The year of the Incarnation, eighteen hundred and fifty-four, the sixth of the Ides of December, in the church of S. Peter, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of our Saviour, was solemnly promulgated by your Holiness, as a dogma of the Christian faith. It is impossible to say how much such an event has astonished us; much more, has afflicted us. We might, perhaps, have been reproached for not having sooner made known our sentiments regarding so prodigious an event. The sincere faith of the Church of

Utrecht is sufficiently well known in the Catholic world. True Catholics have therefore certainly concluded that she rejected without hesitation the new and false dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Most Holy Virgin Mary. But our Church has not considered this good opinion of her faith a sufficient reason for not publicly manifesting her opposition to the new dogma. We owe to our dignity, to the Catholic faith, to the defenders of the truth, its open rejection. This is why we should think we had failed in our duty if we longer kept silence.

'The integrity of the faith in which we have been instructed from our earliest years does not allow us to be silent. The charge which has been entrusted to us, notwithstanding our unworthiness, imposes a very grave obligation upon us, that of openly professing our belief upon the fact in question. We are, indeed, persuaded that the sacred deposit of the faith can neither be augmented nor diminished. In our office of Bishops of the Catholic Church, we have been charged to preserve intact that deposit. "Keep that which is committed to thy trust," wrote S. Paul to his disciple Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 20). S. Vincent of Lérins did not think that this was only written for Timothy; all those who should succeed him, by the very fact that they are bishops, ought to receive this commandment as written for them.

'Now, the opinion which you have promulgated of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, Mother of our Saviour, would add to the faith. In fact, before the eleventh century of the Christian era, no such prerogative was anywhere recognised as belonging to the Blessed Virgin. If we turn either to the Eastern or the Western Church, and interrogate these two parts of the Catholic world upon their faith, we cannot find in either of them the slightest trace of this opinion before the time we have mentioned. If we appeal to the writings of the sovereign pontiffs your predecessors, we are convinced that they did not hold this opinion before the century above-mentioned; still further, it would not be difficult for us to quote some words of the sovereign pontiffs which are contrary to it. Let us only point out Innocent III., Innocent V., and Clement VI. It would be equally easy for us to quote some clear passages of Holy Scripture diametrically opposed to this new opinion. We can gain nothing, then, from the two sources of the Divine word in favour of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, Mother of God. Therefore, to preserve this deposit as much as in us lies, we raise our voices, and we say that the said doctrine carries on its face the mark of novelty. This is the first and important reason which our judgment induces us to put forth.

'The Bishops of the Catholic Church have not been allowed to be judges of this doctrine; and this is the second complaint we have to address to your Holiness. To the Bishops, in short, belongs the right to judge. No notice has been taken of this right attached to the episcopal character. The whole order of Bishops has not been asked its sentiments touching the opinion in question. The letters of those which have been addressed to Rome are only particular writings; the voice of their Churches has not been heard. Now it is certain that the right of judging is inherent in the episcopate. The Council of Jerusalem, the first and the model of all councils, proves the prerogative. For when S. Peter, -the first of the Apostles, had spoken, S. James rose, and said, "My sentence is" (Acts xv. 19). Those Bishops, successors and vicars of the Apostles, who have heard you, by yourself, proclaiming a new dogma of faith, have they safely kept their right? No, indeed, they have only been silent witnesses or contemptible flatterers. How the episcopal dignity was disgraced in this gathering illustrious in appearance! No one came forward as the courageous guardian of his order. Without wishing to fail in the respect which is due

to you, we will tell you the truth, most holy father! To raise the head higher than was right, the most illustrious members of the body have been humbled. Thanks be to God, we have not yet forgotten our dignity, and we complain to you of the injury which has been done to it.

'*The love of our Church*: this is the third reason which obliges us to reject publicly the false dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin. This love demands that we should take the greatest care to preserve our Church free from error. Through the grace of God, the faith has been preserved there pure, notwithstanding the events which have too often shaken it in our country. We have therefore thought that it was our duty to put far from her all novelty in that which regards articles of faith. After the confusion introduced, three years since, in the hierarchical order, the integrity of the Catholic faith might have been threatened. Our intention is to ensure ourselves from this danger; and we ought to use all our efforts to present our Church to Christ as a chaste virgin. Our duty is to transmit to posterity the ancient faith, in its simplicity and purity, as we have received it from our predecessors. Removed from all novelty, as friends of antiquity, we distinguish by this, with Tertullian, the true doctrine from the false,—“That comes evidently from the Lord, and is true, which has been from the beginning; but that is strange and false, which has been added in the course of time.” (Præscript. c. 31.) The Apostle of the Gentiles has warned us not less than Timothy, “avoiding profane and vain babblings (1 Tim. vi. 20); *babblings*, that is to say, novelties of dogmas, of things, of sentiments, which are contrary to truth and to antiquity; if these are admitted, the faith of the holy fathers must be violated in everything, or at least in a great measure.” Thus speaks S. Vincent of Lérins.

'About two centuries ago, the ambassador of Philip IV., king of Spain, asked, in the name of his master, your predecessor, Alexander VII., a decision on the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin. This pope wished to know if he could decide the question, and he interrogated Cardinal Bona on this subject. The pious and learned cardinal replied to him that neither the holy see nor the Church herself could make new articles of faith, but that they could only *declare* what God had revealed to His Church, after having examined, according to rule, the traditions transmitted from the Apostles. “Could I not,” replied the pope, “under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, decide what we ought to believe on this point?” “Most holy Father,” said Bona, “that which might be divinely discovered to you, could only serve for you, and it would not be permitted you to oblige the faithful, any more than myself, to adhere to your decision.” Would to God that a procedure so wise and so catholic had been followed by all the successors of S. Peter!

'We have thought it a matter of honour and duty to offer to your Holiness the pastoral instruction which we have joined to this letter. In order that it may be better and more clearly known in our dioceses what Catholics ought to believe regarding the new dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Holy Virgin, we have published it for the Dutch in the language of our country.

'Our Church has often appealed to the future œcumenical council that shall be legitimately assembled. It appears necessary to us to renew that appeal. On account of the violation which this deposit of the faith has suffered, and because of the injury which has been done to the episcopal order, when it has been desired to establish, as a dogma revealed from God, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of our Saviour, we reserve to ourselves the right to make our appeal in time and place fitting. May the Father of lights give to our

hearts enlightened eyes, and may He work in us that which pleases Him!

‘ We have signed with veneration,

Most Holy Father,

The most humble servants of your Holiness,

✠ JOHN, Archbishop of Utrecht; (Van Santen.)

✠ HENRY JOHN, Bishop of Haarlem; (Van Buul.)

✠ HERMANN, Bishop of Deventer; (Heykamp.)

‘ Given at Utrecht, the 18 of the Calends of September, 1856.

‘ The Secretary-General,

HENRI LOOS.’

The third controversy which has been principally discussed in the pages of the ‘*Observateur*,’ is that of the substitution of the Roman for the Gallican office books. It is well known that the Archbishop of Paris has instituted a commission, which at the present moment is preparing the Breviary about to be adopted in that diocese, by the addition of a Proper of Saints, and such other modifications as local circumstances may necessarily require. It is to this subject, as we have seen, that the ‘*Lettres Parisiennes*’ of Laborde referred. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries almost every diocese in France, following the example of that of Paris, introduced its own offices: all varying more or less from each other, but all based on certain grand principles, the expulsion of uncertain legends, the appointment of a far larger number of Scriptural lessons, the regular and equal weekly recitation of the whole Psalter, the selection of Invitatories, Antiphons and Responses, so far as might be from the words of Scripture alone, and the substitution of modern hymns, chiefly the work of Santeuil, (better known by his Latinised name of Santolius Victorinus) and Coffin, for the more ancient compositions of the Roman Breviary. The modern Gallican Breviaries have been attacked most vigorously by Dom Guéranger, who of course finds Jansenism in them everywhere; and who makes the most of the undoubted slips and heterodox lines, such as,

‘*JESU Redemptor plurium,*’

instead of the Church’s

‘*JESU Redemptor omnium,*’

which may here and there be discovered in them. But it cannot be denied that the manner in which their responses, and especially those of the three leading Breviaries—Paris, Rouen, and Amiens—bring together the Old and New Testament, illustrating one from the other, and thus throwing new light on both, is marvellously beautiful. Neither can it be denied that many of the inconveniences inseparable from the Roman division of the Psalter, and the practical corruptions to which it has

given rise, have been entirely avoided. But it is impossible to go entirely with Laborde and the Gallican party, in their preference of the more modern form. In one point on which they lay great stress, the hymns, those of Rome, reformed, or rather deformed as they were under Pope Urban VIII., are still every way superior to the pretty compositions of French literati in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: and there is often a depth of meaning in some of the rejected antiphons and invitationalies, ill compensated by the more commonplace, if also clearer, passages of the later books.

The '*Lettres Parisiennes*' are eighteen in number. The first two are occupied with the general plan of the work: in the third, the inconveniences of the weekly office in the Roman ritual are pointed out. It is shown that while, on the one hand, the ordinary Sunday has eighteen psalms, and the ordinary week-day twelve, at matins, every saint's-day above a *simple* has but nine, and those selected are from among the shortest in the psalter. Hence, as might naturally be expected, the wish to shorten the service has so completely overloaded the calendar with doubles and semi-doubles, that the Ferial Psalms have scarcely ever a chance of being recited. 'It is easier,' says Laborde, 'on a week-day to recite nine very short psalms, varied with as many lessons, also very short, than to repeat at a single breath twelve psalms, without pause, at the risk of lighting on such an one as the 89th, the 78th, the 104th, 105th, 106th, 107th. We have,' he continues, 'a guarantee for this which cannot be suspected, Dom Guéranger. After having spoken of the Festivals of Saints, which they began again to add to the Breviary soon after the reform, he thus expresses himself: "Clement X. may be regarded as the author of a true liturgical revolution. Until his time, new doubles had not been admitted except with moderation, in order to save the prerogative of Sunday; semi-doubles also had only been created in a very small number." This then was the spirit before the time of Clement X.; that is to say, the spirit of the Council of Trent, which had maintained itself notwithstanding the blows which it had already received. It is clear as the day that the spirit to which France has been more faithful than any other Church has presided over our Breviaries.

'It is, then, under Clement X. that the Roman Breviary began to deviate from the principle of the reformation ordained at Trent, and it has not ceased to deviate still further from it.¹ The same Dom Guéranger agrees with this, in continuing thus on the subject of the same pope:—"This pope," says he, "derogated from this rule in such a marked manner, that after him,

¹ We must except the Pontifical of Benedict XIV.—*Editor's Note.*

'the greater part of the established offices had the double rite: which has definitely changed the character of the Roman Calendar." That is to say, the Roman Breviary has, in this respect, fallen again into the same abuse in which it was before the Council of Trent, and stands in need of the same reformation. The weekly office is in the printed books, and that is all. They never use it, or scarcely ever; and by this they neglect the institution of the ancient Fathers, and the practices of every age since the first centuries, to say the whole of the Psalter once a-week. The words of Cardinal de Sainte-Croix, by which he proved the necessity of reforming the Breviary at the end of the fifteenth century, are as true of our time as they were then: "Some Psalms," says he, "were appointed for every day of the week; the greater part of the time they are of no use. Some of them only are repeated through the year." There are fifty of the shortest of them which are repeated incessantly, and one hundred of the most beautiful, which are never said. *I know some places where they have made the bookbinder leave the Ferial Psalter out of new Breviaries, in order to diminish the weight of the volume.*

But after all, this expedient of replacing the Ferial by Proper Psalms does not always apply, and at present, at least, there are many days in which the twelve which stand in the Breviary must still be recited. Other expedients have therefore been devised to obviate this necessity. On the Thursday, when in the regular course the 78th Psalm, with its seventy-three verses, would occur, the office of devotion in honour of the Blessed Sacrament enables the Roman priests to acquit themselves of their duty with the recitation of but nine short psalms. The Office of the Blessed Virgin serves the same turn on the Saturday. But even all this will not, it seems, answer the purpose in France. Pius V. had regulated that the Sundays of Advent and those from Septuagesima till Easter, should yield, under no circumstances, to any feast whatsoever, except in some particular cases to that of the patron saint if it occurred. Here, then, are thirteen Sundays—just a quarter of the whole—in which the whole Dominical Office, with its eighteen psalms, must, one should say, be recited. But it is not so. The Bishop of Gap, in his pastoral for the establishment of the Roman Office in his diocese, actually promises his priests that they shall have leave to omit nine of the eighteen psalms, if they will accept the new Breviary in other particulars. 'Thus modified,' says he, 'the Roman will not be longer than the Gapanese Breviary.' 'But then,' asks Laborde, 'would it not have been more simple to continue the Gapanese Office, than to say the Roman Office in the Gapanese fashion?'

The tenth letter is occupied by the false legends which, notwithstanding its reform by Pius V., have still retained their place in the Roman Office. The fable about S. Clement, notoriously given up by all good critics, and called by Tillemont a 'stupid and ridiculous story,' has its place in the Lessons for the 23d of November, where we are informed that on that day the sea annually retires from the coast of the Crimea for the space of a week, in order to discover the tomb of the saint. In like manner, the Lessons for Pope S. Marcellinus affirm, contrary to all historical evidence, that he apostatized; those for S. Marcellus, that in the persecution of Maxentius (which persecution never had any existence), he was reduced to take the charge of a stable; and those for S. Sylvester repeat the exploded fable of the leprosy and miraculous cure of Constantine.

M. Laborde did not live to see the grand object of the Ultramontane party accomplished in the substitution of the Roman Breviary for that of the Diocese of Paris. It was not to be expected that his surviving friends could allow the mandaman of Archbishop Sibour to pass without notice; accordingly, there is a very able critique in the '*Observateur*' on that document:—

"The moment appears to have come," says the Archbishop, "to re-establish the Roman Liturgy in this large Diocese."

'To re-establish it, it must have been formerly established there, as we have already remarked; the Archbishop takes it for granted; but his Grace is deceived upon this point. The Roman Liturgy has never been admitted into the Diocese of Paris. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, one of the Gondys, who wished to be cardinal and to please the court of Rome, thought of establishing it, instead of reforming that of his Diocese according to the spirit of the Council of Trent. But he met with so lively an opposition in his Clergy that he was obliged to renounce his project.

'The time is come, according to his lordship, to *tighten*, by the Roman Liturgy, the bands of unity.

'These words are a concession to the unfortunate idea put forth by our modern Ultramontanes, who make unity to consist in things which do not at all concern it. Never, in the Church of Jesus Christ, has it been considered as a gain to abandon local customs and traditions. The Church, destined to visit the whole world, and to enlighten it with the Divine light, suits all nations, so different in manners and language, precisely on account of this legitimate diversity of its liturgies and discipline, which renders possible the adoption of Christianity by nations, which would always be utterly alienated, if there were no means of facilitating the practice of her precepts, and if the faith had not, by prayer or liturgy, an expression in keeping with the nature of their character. To attack the diversity of liturgies or discipline as less conformable to unity, that is to say, as near schism, is to attack indirectly the true unity of the Church,—is to give reason to believe, that Christianity, according to the system of Montesquieu, is impossible for certain people, or, which comes to the same thing, that the Church cannot obtain *Catholicity*, which is, nevertheless, one of its essential and fundamental attributes.'

It is now time that we should turn to one or two of the more salient points of the Abbé Guettée's history. We have, on several previous occasions, directed the attention of our readers to several points of importance in the history of the Gallican Church. We will follow her new historian in his account of one of the most remarkable epochs of her existence—the adoption of the four celebrated Articles of 1682.

It was during the brief interval of the Peace of Clement IX. that the extraordinary controversy broke out which, for a moment, united the Jesuits with the Ultra-Gallicans and with Louis XIV., while it linked the Pope in close alliance with the school of Port Royal, or the so-called Jansenist Bishops. At the epoch of the Concordat, the kings of France had claimed and obtained certain rights of presentation, in contravention of the previous *régime*, over the greater part of the Gallican dioceses. The rights of some were still preserved intact, and among these were the churches of Languedoc. In 1673, Louis XIV., then in the height of his power, resolved to bring the whole of his kingdom under the same rules. The greater part of the prelates were too well bred—to say nothing of their possible expectations of richer sees or archbishoprics—to oppose the slightest difficulties to the will of the sovereign; but it so happened that there were two, and they previously suspected of Jansenism—Pavillon, Bishop of Aleth, and Caulet, of Pamiers—who were made of different stuff, and determined to defend the rights of their respective Churches at whatever cost. The dispute broke out in 1675. Louis XIV. in that year presented a clerk to a benefice in the diocese of Aleth, to which his predecessors had preferred no claim of presentation. Pavillon appealed to the assembly of the clergy, then in actual session, and demanded their assistance in the defence of his rights. That synod, with a prudent regard to temporal consequences, replied that the matter was too weighty for its own decision, and thus virtually left it in the hands of De Harlai, Archbishop of Paris, a man whose ambition and love of pleasure were about equal. It so happened that, at the same time, Caulet had occasion to visit Paris as deputy from the estates of Foix, of which he was, *ex officio*, president. The Jesuit party by whom the king was surrounded, and who had already been informed of his dispositions, sounded him as to his agreement or non-agreement with the Bishop of Aleth; and Père de la Chaise, the Confessor of Louis XIV., demanded formally whether he were willing to acquiesce in the new claims which the king's declaration had put forth. Caulet boldly declared his sentiments, and, having completed the business which had called him to Paris, returned into Languedoc. Assembling his chapter, and foreseeing the

storm which was about to burst over him, it is said that, after stating the full details of his conduct, he addressed his canons in the words of our Lord, 'Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of?' and that they replied without one dissentient voice, 'We are able.' He then, in his own name as well as theirs, addressed a letter to Père de la Chaise, in which he informed the favourite that neither his own conscience nor that of his chapter would allow him to subscribe to the king's mandate.

In the meantime, Pavillon, encouraged by his brother prelate, had suspended, *ipso facto*, the nominee of Louis XIV. and all those who took any part in his induction. The Parliament of Paris condemned his sentence to be burnt; on which the bishop appealed to Rome, and Pont Château, one of the most illustrious disciples of Port Royal, was despatched to inform Innocent XI. orally of the state of the case. By that pontiff he was received with the highest marks of distinction; and was curiously and minutely interrogated as to the health, habits, and diocesan institutions of the Bishop of Aleth, whose asceticism in a dissolute age had been the wonder of Catholic Europe. In the meantime, the suspended nominee of the king appealed to the Cardinal de Bonzi, Archbishop of Narbonne, the metropolitical see of Aleth. That prelate reversed the judgment of his suffragan, and installed the presentee. On this, Pavillon issued a pastoral instruction against the sentence of his metropolitan, and appealed to Rome.

While these events were proceeding, the Bishop of Pamiers was equally harassed. His letter to Père de la Chaise had enraged Louis XIV. to the last degree. It was deliberated in the Council of State whether the recusant bishop should not, by a *lettre de cachet*, be sent into exile; but the more moderate advice of the minister Tellier, and his son the Archbishop of Rheims, prevailed. Determined, however, to assert his pretended rights, on a vacancy of the archdeaconry of Pamiers Louis XIV. presented a person named Poncet to that dignity. It is clear that, even had the rights of the *régale* been such as they were pretended to be, the king could only have nominated to the archdeaconry during the vacancy of the see; but it was the intention of the court to consider the bishop, on account of his recusancy, as civilly dead, and thus at once to assume all his rights. Caulet, as his brother prelate had done, suspended the intruded archdeacon, and those who had assisted in his installation. They, in turn, appealed to their metropolitan, the Archbishop of Toulouse, who, without hearing the case, reversed the sentence of his suffragan. He, as in the former instance, appealed to Innocent XI., who took the case into his own hands.

While affairs were in this posture, Pavillon departed this life, in the eightieth year of his age, and the thirty-ninth of his episcopate, leaving the whole weight of the controversy to fall on the Bishop of Pamiers. Shortly afterwards, the Council of State issued a decree, to the effect that, unless that prelate submitted to the king's ordinance within two months, the temporalities of his diocese should be seized. On this Caulet addressed a letter to the king, in which, while protesting that he never could nor would obey man rather than God, he declared that he was perfectly willing to sustain the loss of all his worldly goods, but would still ask the king that the sums allotted to his cathedral, his two seminaries, and the poor of his diocese, might be exempted from the general confiscation. To this letter no regard was paid. At the day appointed, the agents of the police seized all the effects of the bishop with such rigour, that, though it was the depth of winter, they did not leave him a single fagot for his evening fire. On this, the incumbents of the diocese, who appear to have caught the spirit of the chapter, and had determined to show that they were able to drink of the cup that their bishop should drink of, met in its various localities, and taxed themselves at a certain rate for the support of their diocesan. They also made him a present of two mules, in order that he might be able to continue his diocesan visitations. A collection was also made in Paris for his support, and it was proposed in the Council of State that its principal agent and chief contributor should be sent to the Bastile. 'No,' said Louis XIV. 'I have seized on the temporalities of the Bishop of Pamiers, but I never intended that he should die of hunger; neither shall it be said that any one, in my reign, was punished for giving alms.'

In the meantime Innocent XI. had addressed two briefs to the oppressed prelate; and the high eulogiums which they passed upon him were the last consolations which the old man received in this life. While he was on his death-bed, the assembly of the clergy, under the direction of the courtier-archbishop De Harlai, presented an address to the king, occupied with the most fulsome adulation; and it seemed as if the majority of the Church of France were on the eve of schism with the see of Rome.

On the death of the Bishop of Pamiers, the chapter, not unmindful of its promise, elected for its two vicars ecclesiastics who were most opposed to the stretch of the *régale*. One of these was immediately exiled; the courageous canons, without considering his office vacated, gave him as coadjutor a priest of the same sentiments. The Archbishop of Toulouse professed to consider these appointments as *ipso facto* null and void, and

nominated, by his metropolitical right, two other ecclesiastics vicars-general of the diocese. Thus the wildest confusion prevailed; the magistrates imprisoned those who opposed the king, and the Pope suspended those who obeyed him.

A third source of dissension had its rise at this time. At Charonne there existed an institute of canonesses regular of S. Augustine, who, amidst all the usurpations and corruptions of the age, still maintained its right of electing their own superior. On the demise of the last of these, the king, in the plenitude of his power, nominated a certain sister Marie Angelique, of the Order of S. Bernard, to the vacant office. Her installation was only performed by main force, and the greater part of the sisters, while it was proceeding, rose and left the choir. For this they were punished, by a royal edict, by banishment to distant convents of other orders. A few, however, contrived to assemble, and to acquaint Innocent XI. with what had occurred. On this the Pope directed them to proceed to a canonical election. They did so, and chose another sister Angelique as their superior. Louis XIV. pronounced their election null; Innocent XI. issued a brief reversing the king's edict; and the Parliament quashed the brief, and condemned it to the flames.

It was evident that things could not much longer continue as they were without an open rupture. On the 19th of March, 1681, ten archbishops and forty bishops met, by command of the king, at Paris. The result of their deliberations was, that the king should be requested to permit the convocation of a national council in the following year; and a general assembly of the clergy was accordingly summoned. It was high time. In the diocese of Pamiers the whole chapter had been forced to fly; eighty incumbents were either in prison or in exile; Father Cerlat, the only grand vicar who had not escaped, had been condemned to death by the Parliament of Toulouse. Under these circumstances it was that the celebrated assembly of 1682 was convened: a memorable example how it sometimes pleases God to bring good out of evil, and in this respect to be compared with the miserable origin and the happy termination of the fifth Œcumenical Council.

The rising spirit of the times was Bossuet, then, after having been nominated to the bishopric of Condom, and having resigned it on his appointment as preceptor to the Dauphin, had just been raised to the bishopric of Meaux. It was he who digested in his own mind the proceedings of the assembly in which he was to take so distinguished a part; it was he who, after long consultation with the Archbishops of Paris and Rheims, preached the sermon at the mass of the Holy Ghost,

which was the *bonâ fide* commencement of the proceedings. Speaking of that sermon, 'the tender ears of the Romans,' says he to Cardinal d'Estrées, 'ought to be respected, and I have done it with all my heart. Three points might annoy them: the independence of the temporal power of kings; the episcopal jurisdiction derivable immediately from Jesus Christ; and the authority of councils. You know well that there is but one opinion on these matters in France; and I have endeavoured so to speak that, without betraying the doctrines of the Gallican Church, I might not offend the majesty of the court of Rome. This is all that can be asked of a French bishop, obliged, by the force of circumstances, to speak of such matters. In one word, I have spoken clearly, for that is my duty everywhere, and, above all, in the pulpit; but I have spoken with respect, and God is my witness that I have done it with a good design.'

The letter which the assembly addressed to the Pope has been confidently attributed to Bossuet; he himself seems to assign its authorship to the Archbishop of Rheims. While it was on its way to Innocent XI., the assembly adopted those four famous articles of which he was the undoubted author, and which form the watchword of the Gallican party at the present day:—

'Desirous, then, to remedy these inconveniences, we, archbishops and bishops assembled at Paris by order of the king, with the other ecclesiastical deputies who represent the Gallican Church, have, after full deliberation, judged it fitting to make the rule and declarations which follow:—

'1. That S. Peter and his successors, vicars of Jesus Christ, and that the whole Church also, have received power from God over spiritual things only, and those which concern salvation, and not things temporal or civil; Jesus Christ himself teaching us that "his kingdom is not of this world;" and in another place, that we must "render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's;" and that thus this precept of the Apostle S. Paul can in nothing be altered or shaken, "Let every one be subject unto the higher powers; for there is no power but of God, and the powers that be are all from God. He, then, that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." We declare, in consequence, that kings and sovereigns are not subject to any ecclesiastical power, by the command of God, in temporal things; that they cannot be deposed, directly nor indirectly, by the authority of the heads of the Church; that their subjects cannot be dispensed from the submission and obedience which they owe them, or absolved from the oath of allegiance; and that this doctrine, necessary for the public tranquillity, and not less advantageous to the Church than to the State, ought to be invariably followed, as conformable to the word of God, the tradition of the holy Fathers, and the examples of the saints.

'2. That the plenitude of power possessed by the holy Apostolic See and the successors of S. Peter, vicars of Jesus Christ, over spiritual things, is such that, notwithstanding the decrees of the holy Œcumenical Council of Constance, contained in Sessions IV. and V., approved by the holy Apostolic See, confirmed by the practice of the whole Church and the Roman pontiffs, and observed religiously through all times by the Gallican Church, remain in their strength and vigour; and that the Church of France does not

approve of the opinion of those who attack these decrees, or who weaken them by saying that their authority is not well established, that they are not approved, or that they refer only to times of schism.

‘3. That thus the employment of the apostolic power must be regulated by following the canons made by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the general respect of the world; that the rules, manners, and constitutions, received in the kingdom and in the Gallican Church, ought to retain their strength and vigour; and the customs of our fathers ought to remain unshaken; and that it even tends to the greatness of the holy Apostolic See, that the laws and customs established by the consent of this illustrious See and of the Churches may have the authority which they ought to have.

‘4. That, although the Pope has the principal interest in questions of faith, and his decrees regard all the Churches, and each Church in particular, his judgment is, nevertheless, not irreformable, at least if the consent of the Church does not intervene.

‘And these are the maxims which we have received of our Fathers, and which we have resolved to send to all the Gallican Churches, and to the Bishops which the Holy Ghost has established to govern them, to the end that we may all speak the same thing, that we may all be of the same mind, and that we may all hold the same doctrine.’

These articles were adopted on the 19th of March, 1682. On the following day they were promulgated by Louis XIV. as the law of the State, and, three days later, registered in the Parliament as obligatory to be taught by all ecclesiastics.

It is singular that, from the peculiar circumstances by which these articles were elicited, Arnauld and the Port-Royalists should—however much, on the whole, concurring with their doctrine—have been opposed to their form. At the same time that great divine, from his retreat in Holland, thus expressed himself as to their proposed condemnation by the Papal See:—

‘I cannot help saying that it would be bad advice to give your Holiness, if they urged you to condemn the four articles of the clergy, touching the power of deposing kings, infallibility, and the superiority of the General Council. For the clergy will not want writers in their defence, although they might want them to support their other injustices. And that will produce a great number of writings on both sides, the effect of which will be to play into the hands of heretics, to render the Roman Church odious, to put difficulties in the way of the conversion of Protestants, and to be the occasion of a more cruel persecution against the poor Catholics of England. One may see the beginning already; for a pamphlet has appeared here with this magnificent title—“A reply to the Declaration of the Gallican Church on Ecclesiastical Power, humbly dedicated by Nicholas Ceroli, Marquis of Carreto, to Innocent XI., best, greatest, chief Pontiff, Vicar of Christ, Lord of the City and the World; and only Door-keeper of Heaven, Earth, and Hell; and infallible Oracle of the Faith,” &c. I have not seen it, but M. de Ste. Marthe, who has written to me on the subject, adds:—“The contents of the book are proportioned to the magnificence of the title. He pretends that Jesus Christ, having been King over all the earth, and the Pope being His vicar, the latter has also sovereign power over the whole world, and by consequence over all monarchs.” I lament for the Holy See if it has such defenders; and it is a terrible judgment of God on the Church, if Rome takes this way to defend itself against the French bishops.”’

The summary which the Abbé Guettée gives of the whole affair is worth quoting:—

‘The act had not, as we have seen, the approbation of Bossuet. He judged it inopportune; but the will of Louis XIV., strongly expressed, appeared to him, under the difficult circumstances of the times, a sufficient reason for acquiescing in it. The assembly had, certainly, the intention of expressing the doctrine of the Church of France in the form of canons and decisions. Had it the right? The general assemblies of the clergy were not councils, and were not usually convoked for any other purpose than the regulation of the temporal affairs of the clergy; however, since the famous assembly of Melun, the custom had been introduced, little by little, of discussing doctrinal questions in these gatherings. That of 1682, having been convoked extraordinarily, and for the express purpose of treating of them, believed itself in possession of this right; but we must remark that it attributed to itself no further powers than those which it truly possessed, and only undertook to give declaration to a doctrine which should be obligatory in France, but in France alone. Nor was it even, properly speaking, a decision for France, but simply a declaration of the opinions which had always been those of the Gallican Church; it was a protest, in the name of the clergy of France, against the Ultramontane exaggerations which had made so much way in the contest between the courts of France and of Rome. It is thus that we ought, if we would be just, to appreciate the act of the assembly of 1682.’

It was not to be expected that the four articles would ever be approved by the See of Rome. A special congregation was instituted by Innocent XI. for the consideration of their doctrine; and a censure was prepared by that body for the Pope’s approval and ratification. But Innocent XI. could never be prevailed on to sign that censure. Yet, anxious to give some proof of his disapprobation, he persisted in refusing his bulls for the elevation to the episcopate of those deputies of the second order who had assisted at the assembly.

The death of Innocent XI. did not end the contest. His successor, Cardinal Ottoboni, raised to the chair of S. Peter under the title of Alexander VIII., persisted in his refusal until the ecclesiastics, nominated to the vacant bishoprics, retracted their adhesion to the four articles. In vain was it that the French bishops represented to him that those articles were not to be considered in the light of a dogmatical decree—were not intended to be imposed on other Churches—but were a simple statement of the opinion which had always been held by the Church of France. It was intimated by Louis XIV. that, in case of continued refusal, the consecration of the bishops would take place without their bulls. This had actually been done, in some instances, during the wars of the League—had been threatened by the court of Lisbon when bulls were refused by Rome to the bishops nominated by the House of Bragança after the revolution which placed it on the throne; and the threat now held out was remembered and acted upon, as we have formerly related, by the Church of Utrecht, some twenty years

later. The Pope, after some fruitless negotiations, prepared a bull, by which he annulled all that had been done in the assembly of 1682; it was kept secret for some time, and only published when Alexander VIII. was on his death-bed. The intelligence of its contents, and the news of the Pope's decease, reached France at the same time. The Parliament was about to condemn it to the flames; but Louis XIV., unwilling to come to an open rupture with the court of Rome, represented that it should rather be attributed to the weakness of a dying man, than to the well-weighed determination of the Holy See; that the new Pope might evince greater moderation; and that the surest way to obtain an easy settlement of the difference was to take no notice of the bull that had just been issued. Cardinal Pignatelli, raised to the Papal See under the title of Innocent XII., hastened, in an autograph letter, to acquaint the King of France with his pacific dispositions. Louis XIV., for his part, suspended the civil law, which rendered the teaching of the four articles obligatory; and the Pope at once sent their bulls to those ecclesiastics who had been nominated to bishoprics since the assembly of 1682, but who had not assisted at it. It was understood that both these, as well as those who had been present, were to unite in a letter which should be so drawn up as to please all parties; and with such conflicting interests to be satisfied, it is not wonderful that the composition of this celebrated epistle occupied two years. The terms in which it was finally expressed are these:—

‘The subscribers declare, “that everything which might have been considered as formally decreed in the said assembly, ought to be held as not formally decreed, and that they themselves regarded it in that light; further, that anything which might be considered to have been then deliberated to the prejudice of the rights of other Churches, was held by them not to have been deliberated at all; that their intention had never been to pass a formal decree, nor to do anything that might wrong other Churches: that they hoped, for these reasons, that the Pope would reinstate them in his good opinion, and would issue the bulls now demanded.”’

Such was the conclusion of this famous assembly; a compromise which while it did not, to use Bossuet's expression, grate on the tender ears of the Romans, certainly left the balance of success on the side of the Gallicans. The doctrine of the four articles was neither directly nor indirectly condemned; simply their imposition on other Churches was disavowed, and their obligatory imposition upon France retracted.

The history of this event is related by the Abbé Guettée with great precision and clearness, and forms a remarkable contrast with the obscure and bungling manner in which Rohrbacher narrates it in the ‘History of the Church,’ which some time since we reviewed. At the same time we are bound to say that

our present historian, in the events that followed the assembly, seems to us unduly to depreciate Fénelon, in order that he may unduly exalt Bossuet. It is very true that Rohrbacher has more decidedly erred in the opposite direction; but the reverse of wrong is not necessarily right, and our historian might have been content with assigning to the Eagle of Meaux that place which was allotted to him by the verdict of the eighteenth century,—the most learned Gallican except Gerson, and the most eloquent preacher except Massillon. We remember, on a very fine evening in May, walking up and down the arcade of yew-trees, Bossuet's favourite resort, in his episcopal gardens; the western *façade* of the cathedral seen through the branches on one side, the town clustering below the palace on the other. We had been discussing the character of Bossuet with the vicar-general of the diocese, and he summed it up thus:—‘He was a great man, and he was a good man, and he is with the saints; but we must not make him into a saint himself.’

We had intended to notice one or two other of the more remarkable events in the later history of the Church of France, which the volumes before us contain. We might in particular refer the reader to the account, now for the first time fairly and dispassionately given, of the infamous Council of Embrun, and the deposition and imprisonment of the venerable Bishop Soanen, of Senez. But, above all other parts of the work, the portion which treats of the ecclesiastical annals of the first Revolution is the most curious. The bias of the Abbé Guettée is decidedly in favour of those who by other Church writers have been branded with every appellation of infamy, the constitutional bishops, and more especially Grégoire, whom he exalts into a hero, and into something like a confessor. But it will be fairer, both to the writer and to ourselves, to reserve that part of his work till the appearance of his ‘*Mémoires pour servir à l’Histoire de l’Eglise de France, depuis le Concordat de 1801 jusqu’à nos jours*,’ already advertised with the significant notice, ‘*Pour paraître dès que les circonstances le permettront*.’ To judge by his account of the Revolution, our author’s annals of the nineteenth century are likely to be as little pleasing to Imperialists as to Ultramontanes; and whether circumstances will permit their publication till after another Revolution, is a point which may reasonably be doubted. We shall look, however, for the promised work with great interest; and certainly to no author were the words ever more applicable:—

‘*Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas; et incedis per ignes
Suppositos cineri doloso.*’

- ART. V.—1. *The State of the English Bible.* By the Rev. WILLIAM HARNESS, A.M. London: Longmans. 1856.
2. *Notes on the Proposed Amendment of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures.* By WILLIAM SELWYN, Canon of Ely, &c. Cambridge: Deighton. 1856.
3. *A Vindication of the Authorized Version of the English Bible from Charges brought against it by Recent Writers.* By the Rev. S. C. MALAN, M.A. London: Bell & Daldy. 1856.
4. *Revised English Version of the Holy Scriptures.* By the American Bible Union. London: Trübners. 1856.
5. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle: an original Translation, with Critical Notes and Introduction.* By JOSEPH TURNBULL, Ph. Dr. V.D.M. Honorary Secretary of the Anglo-Biblical Institute. London: Bagster. 1854.

WE believe that Sir George Grey was quite correct in his assertion that the people of England do not desire any alteration in the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. We believe that the great body of religious people would rather shrink from any attempt to promote such a change. They are, of course, generally speaking, unable to judge of the need of such changes: this can only be judged of by the learned; but they rely on the general testimonies to the excellence of our Version, and on the fact that the corrections called for seem not important; they find religious parties who differ most widely on all other points, yet concurring in their love and deference to their Bibles; their naturally conservative disposition is here combined with affection and religious reverence for those holy words which are entwined in their inmost souls, and the tones of which linger around the tenderest recollections of their lives; and they can see much difficulty and risk in making changes in a book so highly esteemed and widely accepted.

But, on the other hand, there are dispositions and movements in favour of a revision of our Authorized Version, which may become stronger, and which, in the natural course of things, are likely to do so, even were they now as a cloud no bigger than a man's hand. There are many, with whom we fully sympathise, whose deep reverence for Holy Scripture, and appreciation of its value, make them desirous that the version which is in the hands of our people should be as perfect as possible, and who do in consequence earnestly desire its correctness. There are those—too many—who have not any very deep reverence for Scripture, who are not accustomed to study it with devotion, to whom the Bible is a book for curiosity or controversy, and who seek only on general grounds that it should be correctly translated. The growing intelligence and wide-spread information,

the 'unbounded curiosity' of our day, will strengthen the number of those who seek the revision on intellectual grounds. Lastly, there are those who would wish for change for change's sake, who accuse the religious people of England of Bibliolatry, and would wish to see their idol broken, would even rejoice at their being unsettled,—looking to substitute what they call the love of truth, and of inquiry, for the simple faith with which our people receive their Bible, and the truths generally agreed on among Christians. By such persons—and they are among the most active and unwearied of our day—any change, anything unsettling, would be desired.

Now the movement parties, in such cases, are the most active, and they have one very tangible and very forcible argument, viz. That the present version is incorrect; and nothing is more simple than to infer from this that it ought to be corrected. This is an argument which will certainly be put before the public more and more; even now a paper of the widest circulation, yet of the smallest authority, is publishing, under the auspices of a *littérateur* whose position is tolerably well ascertained, weekly specimens of the errors of our version, setting side by side with it what is said to be the correct translation, showing how much more clear and instructive the passages become when rightly rendered. And there seems to people generally no reason why the best means should not be used to make it correct.

We may be quite sure, from past experience, that there will be no activity, no expense spared, by the most decided promoters of 'Revision;' and that there are parties who would wish to go very far in that direction. It is true that the advocates for it have received some checks. The circumstance that Mr. Heywood should have taken up the subject in the House of Commons, when he had so recently offended the House and the country by his observations on the Books of Scripture, must prejudice persons against it. And one great organization established in the United States for the revision of the Authorized Version, which was supported by persons of various religious denominations, both in America and in England, has recently been shown by its late President to be a great system of carelessness and jobbing.

Still, the tendencies of the times are such as to force on us all the consideration of the subject,¹ with the view of not only

¹ *E. g.* There is one case mentioned by Professor Selwyn, in which especially a difficulty is felt—the making translations of the Scriptures into foreign languages by the great Societies. The translators are bound to conform to the Authorized Version, when yet they see that it is incorrect. This rule of conforming translations in other languages to the Authorized Version might easily be modified; still, while it exists, it forces on the notice of translators the variations between the original and our version.

seeing what is abstractedly best, but what is possible and practically attainable. All, we conceive, must agree that, if possible, our translation ought to represent, as faithfully as the differing idioms of the respective languages allow, the meaning of the original; but, like every other great and general truth, the difficulty lies not in seeing and admitting it in the abstract, but in applying it to practice; whilst there is a counter advantage in the general recognition of one and the same version by our whole people, not by ourselves in England only, but by the Scotch Presbyterians and dissenters of all shades of non-conformity; by the whole people of America,—all their various sects; and by the new world of Australia. If we have a Version made ever so perfect, can we secure its general acceptance? Can we make it be what the Authorized Version now is? Is it worth while to sacrifice our unanimity for a small benefit? or can the alteration be so made as to secure unanimity? It is surely well worth while to consider this.

The movements in favour of such a revision which have been most prominently manifested, have been by the Bible Union, and the Bible Revision Association, in America, and an obscure association in our own country called the Anglo-Biblical Institute, the honorary secretary of which has published a new translation of S. Paul's Epistles, and which with its chairman, Dr. Richard Wilson, and a hundred signatures, petitioned the House of Commons in favour of Mr. Heywood's motion. Judging from the work of its honorary secretary (though this is being reprinted), the English association appears to be unworthy of attention. The American societies are rather an indication of a wish among some of the sects known as Evangelical Protestants, and a few members of the Church here and in America, for a revised translation. But among Dissenters generally we believe there is no such wish. They acquiesce in the Authorized Version, if possible, more simply than Church people, being satisfied to have it corrected or elucidated by annotations. The fate of the American Bible Union would appear to be sealed, since the discoveries which have been made of the carelessness of the managers, the unfitness of the translators and 'revisers,' and the sectarian tendencies discovered among its promoters.

In England, owing to Dr. Cumming's unfortunate disposition to put himself into prominence on every occasion, though it be but to display his own ignorance, the columns of the 'Times' have become the chief, as they are the cheapest and most effectual, organ for drawing the attention of the public to the subject.

Two or three publications have appeared formally professing to treat on the subject, which therefore may require a more

formal notice from us. The first is an article in the 'Edinburgh Review' for October, 1855, by the Rev. W. Harness, advocating the appointment of a permanent Commission to be continually revising the Authorized Version, as from time to time may seem necessary. This article has since been reprinted, owing, as it is said, to the increased interest in the subject, and consequent request for its republication. Another is a very moderate and judicious pamphlet by Canon Selwyn, advocating only the appointment of a Commission, apparently by the Crown; and suggesting at first only the printing the corrections of the translation in the margin, or at the end of our Bibles, so that they might be gradually brought into the text, when people had become familiar with them. The author sets forth the many advantages which would arise from this, but omits all consideration of the difficulties and dangers incident to such a revision. On the other hand, Mr. S. C. Malan, one of our best Oriental scholars, has sent out in two parts a defence of the Authorized Version, which is rather an able criticism of portions of the revised versions sent out by the American Bible Union, and the honorary secretary of the Anglo-Biblical Institute, to which we may have occasion to refer incidentally.

If it be the case that the republication of Mr. Harness' article is called for by the interest taken in the subject, it is clear that 'straws show which way the wind blows;' for it is a very light article, indeed, even for a review, and quite unworthy of separate publication. It is made up of obvious remarks on the form in which our Bibles are published; and on the importance of a correct translation, with instances of overliteral, obsolete, obscure expressions, which would readily present themselves to any one. The only appearance of learning is derived from passages of Mr. Jowett and Mr. Stanley's volumes, some of the latter being unacknowledged (compare Harness, p. 25, and Stanley, vol. ii. pp. 312—314). Unfortunately in one point the reviewer left his authority, and attempted a little learning of his own. Mr. Stanley says: 'Some are not mistranslations so much as retentions of the original Greek or Latin words: e. g. . . . "charity" for ἀγάπη, from the Vulgate *caritas*, instead of "*love*."' Mr. Harness improves the observation thus:—

'Why is ἀγάπη *love* throughout the Gospels, but occasionally exchanged for *charity* in the Epistles; a word adopted from the Vulgate, and only intelligible to the classical theologian (!), who knows that *love* is a fruit of *grace*; that *grace* is English for χάρις; that χάρις is the etymological root of *charity* (!), and that, consequently, *charity* may be used as a synonyme for *love*?'

It is evident Mr. Harness thinks that *caritas* is a derivative of χάρις. We thank him and the 'Edinburgh' for this discovery;

for laying open to the world the ignorance of the man who presumes, as Mr. Harness does, to ridicule and sneer at the English Version of the Bible, when he himself is unconsciously exhibiting an ignorance of Greek, Latin, and English all at once.

Mr. Harness dwells much on the division of the Bible into chapters and verses, and recommends paragraph Bibles, in which also the poetical parts of Scripture may be printed in lines; and he blames those whom it concerns, because the Authorized Version is not printed so. We entirely agree in the preference for paragraph divisions (they are used in the 'Church Services'), and for making the division of the Hebrew poets catch the eye. But the complaint against authorities, because Bibles are not printed so, is grounded on a mistake. Paragraph Bibles have been tried, and do not sell. Those that were printed some years ago at the Clarendon Press are still on hand. They may be had at the Oxford Bible Warehouse in all variety of binding. But so long as the common Bibles are cheaper, and the great Societies do not circulate paragraph Bibles, they will not come into general use.

Again, Mr. Harness complains that the Sacred Books are all made into one book, the Bible. He thinks they should be printed and purchaseable separately: speaking in contempt of the notion that the books acquire a unity by being bound up together; as if they were not 'the Book' marked off as one, and severed by their Divine original from all other writings. Also he would be very witty in his complaints of the inconvenient and awkward forms of our Bibles. Mr. Harness will find that many single books of the Scriptures are printed separately; he can buy them at the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and other places; but we believe few are sold. About fifty years ago (in 1802) Reeves, the King's Printer, published a very handsome Library Edition of the Bible in fine type, in nine octavo volumes, very well got up, which would range on your shelves with Hume or Gibbon, or the Library Edition of Sir Walter Scott—a book, in fact, which no one would suspect to be a Bible. But we presume it did not sell so well as to induce a repetition of the experiment. Mr. Harness says, 'Whatever the public may demand, will in some shape be supplied.' Bibles are not published in the style Mr. Harness desires for this very reason—that there is no demand for them.

Mr. Harness' other observations we may refer to in the course of this article. But there is one argument put forward by him and by others which it is necessary to consider at the outset; viz. That an incorrect translation is destructive of the end for which Holy Scripture was given,—to be, as he says, our sole guide into the truth.

If possible, indeed, one would have a version of the Scripture perfectly mirroring the original—correct, adequate, and precise. It is desirable that it should do this; and the more we esteem the Divine Word, and the more we feel the power and divinity of every part of it, the more we shall desire it. But desirable as this may be, it by no means follows that an inadequate or partially incorrect version may not very sufficiently answer the purposes for which the Holy Scriptures were given—the instruction and edification of the people. The inconsiderate things that are said on this subject make some observations on it not out of place.

We hear now again of the Protestant principle of each one judging for himself of the meaning of Holy Scripture, from its very letter; and consequently of the necessity of the version from which our countrymen are so to judge of truth, being made as perfect as possible. Does it never strike those who argue thus, that the very fact that the Holy Scriptures are accessible to the great body of Christians only through the medium of translation is fatal to this principle? It is absolutely impossible for any translation so exactly to represent the original as to make it as safe to argue from the version as from the original. It is absolutely impossible to daguerreotype those shades of meaning and force of words which the original expresses, and on which the precise doctrinal force of a passage turns in any translations. Besides, how is the 'Protestant' to know that the translation is correct? or if he desires to have a precise knowledge of the force of the original, why does he repudiate all notes and comments? The truth is, the great Protestant principle is an absurdity; and Mr. Harness, after laying down the theory in its broadest form, in all sincerity and simplicity, as the great Protestant principle, complains that it only exists in theory. It cannot exist in any other way. No version can exactly represent the original. But even a poor version may represent it sufficiently for all practical purposes; that is, for all purposes of faith and piety. They who wish to go further intellectually, and they who are able to go further, must have recourse to paraphrases and notes, or to the original. It is but an instance of the differences in the gifts and privileges afforded by God to His creatures, that some should have the power of entering more exactly into the meaning of His written Word than others. But to all is given sufficient guidance, if they will take the Scriptures in their own tongue, and study them by the aid of the Church as their outward, and the Spirit as their inward, teacher. This may be some comfort to us, if it should not be possible to have a correct Received Version; and if, as it is certain must be the case, we are at last obliged to be content with an inadequate one.

It is, indeed, alleged that statements, which are stumbling-blocks, and excite objections against the truth, the consistency, or the holy teaching of Scripture, as presented in our Authorized Version, would be altered by correct translation. Yet, surely, this would but remove the difficulty. The same persons who now find difficulties, or raise objections to Holy Scripture, on grounds arising from faulty translation, which difficulties and objections would, by the hypothesis, be obviated by a knowledge of the original, may surely, in our day, find what the meaning of the original is by comments and explanations, or by consulting those who know more than themselves. And if they be so minded as not to wish sincerely to have their difficulties solved, the same temper of mind would find, if not the same, yet other difficulties, perhaps more numerous, in the words of the original. Of course, it is not meant that we should willingly leave any such stumbling-blocks; but it is not sufficiently remembered that they cannot be entirely removed—and that persons who only use their understanding to find objections, and will not go forward to ascertain or understand the solution of them, must remain in darkness.

Now persons expect too much from a translation; the representing the original fully and adequately is the province, not of a translator, but of an expositor. No translation can adequately express the whole of the original: this must be done by paraphrases or explanations. There are many turns of expression in the original which have their own proper force, and the perception of which throws light on the meaning of the writer, as well as gives beauty and clearness and force to his words, which cannot be transfused into a translation—still less into a translation so precise as that of the Holy Scriptures ought to be. He, indeed, who attempts a translation so exact is in continual danger of trenching on the province of the expositor; as in such instances as the following, from recent translations, where '*which* is the mother of us all,' or '*whose* are the covenants,' are translated 'because she is,' or 'for theirs are;' the relative being held, probably correctly, to have an argumentative force. If you translate 'whose are,' you will be told that your version is inadequate—that the original implies a reason, which the translation does not necessarily do, though it suggests it. If you translate 'for theirs are,' you certainly determine the meaning, but it is undetermined in the original. Now a translation which exactly mirrors the original ought to represent its ambiguities, its indeterminateness, its occasional unintelligibility.

Difficult as the work of translation necessarily is, this difficulty is greatly increased when the subject of translation is the

Holy Scriptures; for the sacredness of the text, and the importance of conveying as accurately as possible the sense of the original, and particularly of not bringing into the translation ideas which are not in the Written Word itself, limit the freedom of the translator. He must not paraphrase, nor yet venture upon phrases which seem to be equivalent.

Literal and exact translation must be first considered. We may not imitate, but we may think of the early translators of the Scriptures into Latin, who preserved the very order of the Greek words, and, as it seems, their cases too, when in doing so they made their Latin ungrammatical; or of Aquila, who translated the Hebrew into Greek, with an accuracy which sacrificed the Greek idiom and use of terms to the precise representing of the Hebrew original: such was their desire to 'mirror' the original with precision.

But the difficulty of making a version of Holy Scripture is increased when that version is to be the 'Authorized Version,' when it comes forth with the sanction of the Church; for an individual translator may venture on adopting an interpretation on his own responsibility, with more freedom than they can do who are sending out a version with authority. They cannot venture upon a rendering which is not with a high degree of probability the true one.

On this subject we gladly extract the following passage from Conybeare and Howson's '*Life and Epistles of S. Paul*':—

'The Authorized Version was meant to be a standard of authority and ultimate appeal in controversy; hence it could not venture to depart, as an ordinary translation would do, from the exact words of the original, even where some amplification was absolutely required to complete the sense. It was to be the version unanimously accepted by all parties, and therefore must simply express the Greek text, word for word. This it does most faithfully so far as the critical knowledge of the sixteenth century permitted. But the result of this method is sometimes to produce a translation unintelligible to the English reader. Also, if the text admit of two interpretations, our version endeavours, if possible, to preserve the same ambiguity, and effects this with admirable skill; but such indecision, although a merit in an authoritative version, would be a fault in a translation which had a different object.'—*Conybeare and Howson (Introduction)*, p. xiii. ed. 1.

'But,' (they add in a note,) 'had any other course been adopted, every sect would have had its own Bible; as it is, this one translation has been all but unanimously received for three centuries.'

Further, the circumstance that a version of Holy Scripture is intended to be read by all classes and to all classes in the Service of the Church, and must therefore be, so far as possible, simple in its language and structure, and intelligible to all, requires a translator to abstain from many turns of expression which might, indeed, precisely represent the original to the mind

of the scholar, and of which the force might be perceived and appreciated by the educated, but which would not be easily perceived by the poor or the unlearned.

Add to this; dignity and gravity befit a translation of the Holy Scriptures; and this is happily secured by the use of language which belongs to a former age, and which, from association, carries with it the impression of sacredness. The Apostles, it may be said, wrote in the language which their converts ordinarily used. This may be doubted; thus much at least is certain,—they used a phraseology partly derived from the ancient Scriptures of the Jews, and carrying with it all the sacred associations belonging to them, partly new, but Christian, connected with the ideas and doctrines which were now first made known to the converts, intimately connected with their new and peculiar life, the inward life of their souls, and with all the mysterious truths that were freshly revealed to them. They were the words of Apostles, who spoke in the plenitude of the Spirit, and wrought miracles, around whom was a halo of sanctity, which the nimbus but faintly figures. All these sacred features of the words of the Apostles, as first written, we not inadequately represent by a language different from that of our common daily life. It may be thought needless to say this; but in any rage for improving our version of Holy Scripture, it will be found most necessary to maintain our ancient phraseology on grounds of reason as well as of feeling.

But when persons speak as if a version with some few mistakes in it does not fulfil the end of a version of Holy Scripture, let them remember the very remarkable fact, that whereas the Holy Scriptures have ever been known to the great body of Christians through the medium of translations, those translations have always been imperfect; nay, more or less incorrect. The Scriptures of the Old Dispensation were read by large portions of the Israelites in the translation of the Seventy, often very wrong in its renderings, and adding to the sacred words; in the same form, or in translations from it, they were read by Christians. The more accurate versions of the critics of those days, brought together by the labours of Origen, did not avail to displace the old received version among the Greeks, though they may have modified it. Some centuries elapsed before Jerome's translation from the Hebrew supplanted the old and barbarous Latin versions of earlier times made from the Septuagint. Nay, even among ourselves the old version of the Psalms, confessedly incorrect, is much nearer our hearts, and much more connected with our devotional sentiments, than is that of the Bible, and it is the form in which alone nine-tenths of our Church people know the Psalms. By God's overruling care

and guidance it has been secured that the versions of Holy Scripture, which are received in the Church, even where they inadequately or incorrectly reflect the sense of the original, should not teach error either in matters of morals or belief. Such has been the guiding control of God's Spirit—such the sentiment of truth in His Church. According to God's appointment, the doctrine and teaching of the Church, and the inward unction of His Holy Spirit, accompany the written Word; and there is here a preservative from the effects of error in the versions of Scripture, as well as from a misunderstanding of the original. It is true persons have found a sanction for erroneous opinions in the imperfections of translation. But the Holy Scriptures themselves, read in their original language by those to whom that was their mother tongue, were equally capable of being wrested to their own destruction. One may trace in the history of opinions the influence of the phraseology and the ideas suggested by the Received Versions; but so may we also the effects resulting from misapprehension of the originals. They who spoke the original language of the New Testament were no less varied in their forms of error than those who know translations only. And a very poor version, devoutly studied by a believing and religious person, would be a much surer aid, in all matters of faith and morals, than the original Greek or Hebrew studied by one of perverse mind; because it is not the precise intellectual discernment which is valuable, but the appreciation of the heart; and it is the knowledge of the great truths—the essence, as it were, of Holy Writ—which is eternal life, not the correct understanding of this or that passage. In its jealousy of authority, and jealousy respecting the written Word, Protestantism has exaggerated the necessity of a precise acquaintance with the letter of Scripture, which, in fact, is quite impossible for any but the learned. The truth is, that the Divine Scriptures are so replete with spiritual nourishment, that even when injured by inadequate or incorrect rendering, they yet contain abundant food for the Christian soul; nay, some lessons of truth and holiness may be suggested even by an imperfect translation. Of this we cannot have a better proof than the citations of the Old Testament in the New, and the comments of the Apostles of our Lord upon them, even when they incorrectly represent the original: *e.g.* 'Be ye angry, and sin not,' is well known to be a wrong rendering by the Seventy of the Hebrew, 'Stand in awe, and sin not;' and yet the Apostle alleges it in its incorrectness. And so there has been many a holy thought suggested, many a profitable lesson of Christian piety learned, even from the imperfect and incorrect renderings of our Psalms.

The Holy Scriptures are not, nor ever were designed to be, the sole instructors of the people. The statement made on this point is simply self-contradictory. It is plainly not possible for the unlearned reader to master those questions which turn upon such points of difference as exist between the original and the translation. If Holy Scripture is presented to any through the medium of a translation, it must, like all other things so circumstanced, be in some degree modified by the imperfection of the medium through which it is presented.

The very nature of language makes it impossible for the version to represent the original precisely. Words have each in their own language shades of meaning for which no one word in another is an equivalent. Combinations of words express ideas which no other language can convey, except by paraphrases and explanations. What English word is an equivalent to the *φρονεῖν* of the Greek? or to the modified senses of *νόμειν*, or of the *νόμος* and *δικαιοσύνη* of S. Paul? The translator falls behind in any attempt even to grasp the full idea; still more, to express it by a single word. How then shall we express, in their fulness or precision, the thoughts and language of S. Paul? The knowledge of the original language, and a very refined and critical knowledge of it too, can alone enable a person fully to enter into the meaning of the words of the sacred book. They who have not this advantage suffer so far; and it is not possible in the nature of things to remedy the deficiency by a mere translation. It can only be done by paraphrases and explanations; but He who gives grace to the lowly, will, we may trust, abundantly compensate to the sincere such want of head knowledge by the illumination of the heart.

These considerations are, indeed, no argument against making a version as correct as possible. But if any circumstances hinder this, they may make us well content with a good version, even if it were possible there might be a better.

And it cannot be denied that the Authorized is a good Version. The consent of other countries as well as our own place it among the first of such compositions. It is not necessary for us to repeat praises which will suggest themselves to every mind, and find a response in every heart. In its majesty, gravity, simplicity, and the harmony and beauty of its phraseology, it cannot be surpassed: but it is not perfect.

Let us see something of what can be said against it. And here we will confine ourselves, from the very extent of the subject, to the New Testament; as it will scarcely be said that our knowledge of Hebrew has made any such *certain* progress, as to enable us to determine the correctness of renderings in the Old Testament with the same precision as those of the New.

We keep apart, at present, the subject of the text; and then, as regards the translation, we may affirm, *that there is no allowed mistake of translation which teaches error in any material point of faith or practice.*

In saying this, we do not mean to affirm that there are not inadequate or disputed or even incorrect renderings, in passages that bear on faith and morals; but none which state anything contrary to the truth in our translation. We are obliged to speak of the truth as something fixed and settled, whether we should explain it to be the catholic faith, held ever, everywhere, and by all, or that which is implied in and attested by the general teaching of Holy Scripture. For the disputed or interpolated verse in 1 John v. does but express the general sense of Scripture; and this may be said also of the common reading in 1 Tim. iii. 16. So the verse, 'All scripture is given by inspiration of God,' &c., even if it mean 'every scripture given by inspiration of God is also useful,' &c. does not state anything which is not abundantly stated elsewhere. That is to say, no rationalist could deny that S. Paul and the rest of the Apostles believed all the canonical Jewish Scriptures to be inspired, or that the New Testament throughout implies that they are. The place which is most near to the fault of teaching error is in Gal. v., where we have 'the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, so that ye *cannot* do the things that ye would'—instead of 'that ye may not do whatever you are inclined to;' but this is capable of a sound interpretation.

We can have no doubt that the more correct our version of the Scriptures is made, the more would it not only promote the cause of truth generally, but confirm the truths we hold; the more perfect it is, the more vividly would the truth come out. And it is most desirable for the truth's sake, that the Authorized Version should be above suspicion. All we mean to affirm now is, that our present version is sufficient for all the great ends of a version of Holy Scripture. And when we consider the general confidence that is placed in it by parties differing most widely, it is evident that it is felt to be on the whole fair and truthful.

Each body of Dissenters may suppose that a different version of some passages would give clearer sanction to their views; but they know that a different version of other passages would have a contrary effect. Thus, if some texts as now read or translated bring out the Divine Nature of our blessed Lord more than the Greek as read by critics, others bring it out less than the pure original: *e.g.* if people by an ambiguity in our version of 1 John iii. 16, 'Hereby perceive we the love of God, because *He* laid down his life for us,' referring

'*He*' to '*God*'—of *Goð* being inserted by the translator, as the italics show—see a testimony to our Lord's Divine Nature which is not in the original, on the other hand they lose one in the passage, John v., where the words, '*He said that God was his Father,*' mean (we need scarcely say) '*his own Father*;' that is, He said that God was his Father in a special, peculiar sense: and another in 2 Pet. i. 1, '*God and our Saviour JESUS CHRIST,*' for '*our God and Saviour.*' It has apparently been thought by the Baptists, that their views would gain by a more exact translation. We apprehend not, for they could not translate βαπτίζω, 'immerse:' no fair scholarship would authorize their doing this; and they would lose the wrong impression conveyed by '*Go, teach all nations, baptizing them,*' from which they argue that the fit subjects for baptism must be fit recipients of teaching; and by John iii. '*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit,*' instead of, '*except one*' ('*a person*') '*be born again,*' &c.; and '*all the house*' of the jailer at Philippi, who were baptized with him, instead of '*all his family.*' So, if we lose the supposed support of apostolical episcopacy by the text respecting Judas, '*his bishoprick let another take,*' being translated '*his office,*' we gain by the right translation of 1 Pet. v. where he says to the elders '*not lording it over God's heritage,*' which ought to be '*over your portions*' of the flock, or '*the portions allotted to you.*'

The old Puritans and their modern representatives in America and England may object to the translation of ἐκκλησία by Church, διάκονος by Deacon, and ἐπίσκοπος by Bishop; but it can easily be shown that the Church's rendering is correct. And indeed, now when '*congregations*' call themselves Churches, we presume that the old objection would scarcely be alleged. In 1611 the term '*Church*' suggested the true idea of the Church; and they who were for rejecting that, wished to take away the seeming Scripture argument for the Church by using the word '*congregation.*' But now the long use of this version has led the sects to adopt the sacred name of Church, and we presume they would not wish to see it removed from Scripture. The American Baptists would translate βαπτίζω '*to immerse*;' whilst the retention of the original word leaves that point as open as it was left by the original.

2. *There are few actual errors in our translation; i.e.* but few places where the translators have made a mistake in the meaning of the Greek. We mean where they would be generally allowed by scholars to have done so, setting aside doubtful places; such as '*Search the Scriptures,*' for '*Ye search the Scripture.*' Of the Hebrew of the prophetic and poetical Books we will not speak so confidently; there, probably, the errors are more

numerous: but the difficulty lies not so much in saying, 'This is not correct,' as in saying what is correct.

The faults that have been alleged against our version of the New Testament, are rather the want of adequacy and precision in representing the original than actual error. Thus a recent annotator on the two Epistles to the Corinthians, (whose observations are cited by Mr. Harness,) in giving a translation of the Epistles, being 'the text of the Authorized Version, with such 'corrections only as were required for the sake of more faithfully representing the sense of the original,' enumerates the causes of his corrections, as arising from the adopting a different text; from a different punctuation; from transposing the words into a nearer conformity with the original order; bringing out the emphasis apparent in the original, from the use of the pronouns, or the arrangement of the words; and lastly, from correcting the errors produced by inaccuracy of translation.

Now it is plain that most of these are rather improvements, if so be, than corrections of errors. And under the last head of inaccuracy Mr. Stanley enumerates—

1. Those which arise from mere carelessness,—of these he says there are very few: he instances only 'JESUS CHRIST,' in 1 Cor. i. 4, for 'Christ Jesus;' 1 Cor. i. 7, 'coming' for 'revelation;' and the omission of 'own' in 1 Cor. iii. 19; vii. 37.

2. Those which he attributes to theological fear or partiality; as *ἀδόκιμος*, translated 'castaway,' in 1 Cor. ix. 27, instead of 'reprobate;' and 1 Cor. xi. 26, 'eat and drink,' instead of 'eat or drink.' (We think the correctness of the motive assigned very questionable.)

3. Obsolete expressions; as 'meat' for 'food,' 'servant' for 'slave;' under which we may class the 'its,' 'his,' 'her,' used so differently from what they now mean.

4. The retention of the original Greek and Latin words; as he instances 'mysteries' for 'secrets,' 'heresies' for 'sects,' 'charity' for 'love,' 'church' for 'congregation.' (We need scarcely say how questionable some of these points are.)

5. 'The greater part,' he says, 'are such as result from an imperfect attention to the language, or from the real difficulty 'of the style.' And he instances,—

- a. The translating the aorist, like a present or perfect,—we may add, the inadequate rendering of the tenses generally.

- b. Inattention to the omission or use of the article; (to which others would add, want of care as to the sense of prepositions.)

- c. Carelessness as to using, if possible, one and the same English word for one and the same Greek, or *vice versâ*. The last fault is one much dwelt on by all advocates for revision.

Now these, we repeat, rather make the translation inadequate, or deficient in precision, than incorrect.

Still they are defects—that is undeniable. And if they could be remedied, without producing greater defects or greater evils, let them be remedied.

Professor Selwyn, at the close of his pamphlet, expresses the following sentiment:—

‘I had intended to notice some of the possible dangers attendant on the proposed revision; but when I think of them, they seem to sink into nothing before the sacred obligation to do for posterity what our forefathers did for us, to hand down the Word of God in the purest and most perfect form that is attainable at the present day. Let us be no longer deterred from this good work by vague fears of unknown difficulties: they cannot be so great now as they were in 1611. *O passi graviora, dabit Deus his quoque finem.* The providence of God and the Spirit of God will guide us through all difficulties.’—*Selwyn*, p. 42.

This pious sentiment we would gladly embrace; but we cannot think it inconsistent with trust in God, or love for truth, to look before us, and to see what it is proposed to do, and what is likely to be done, and what are likely to be the results. Surely it is fair to ask in what direction and to what point we are to be carried, before we commit ourselves—before we join in any plan for revision.

And on these points we confess we do not see much agreement, (1) as to the extent of the changes desired, or the principles on which they should be made; (2) the authority by which they are to be determined; (3) or the probability of their meeting with general acceptance,—subjects which are very much involved in each other.

And, first, we do not find any general agreement among the advocates of a revision as to the objects or extent of that revision. Mr. Heywood speaks of the changes desired as very slight. He, in common with almost all the advocates of revision, proposes to retain the Authorized Version, and only correct it; yet he would have the *text* altered as well as the translation. Selwyn says that all the corrections proposed by Professor Scholefield in the New Testament are but 500; and he reckons there would be as many in the Old Testament. But he speaks as if only 100 alterations would suffice in the New Testament. Mr. Malan, the defender of the Authorized Version, admits that some changes are desirable, but so few and of such a nature that they might be made almost without any one being aware of the alteration. But, on the other hand, Mr. Harness (p. 39) instances the ‘819th page of the “Annotated Paragraph Bible,” which contains no ‘more than seventeen verses of the eighth chapter of Jeremiah,’ in which seventeen verses there are five corrections. Besides, if, on Canon Selwyn’s principle, Professor Scholefield’s im-

provements were adopted, consistency would require the introduction of many more, as his attention was chiefly directed to one or two classes of defects. And when we are told by other writers what they wish to see done, it is evident that the changes would be very great before the end was obtained of making the version as exact a representation of the original as possible. For one would correct the personal pronouns, the 'his' and 'her' by substituting 'its'; another the prepositions, the 'if' and 'by' and 'after'; another the irregular translations of the same Greek and Hebrew words, when used in the same sense, by different English words, or of different Greek and Hebrew words by the same English. This, which is very generally desired among advocates for revision, would very soon exhaust Professor Selwyn's limit of 1000. Another would, and with great reason, correct the inadequate and incorrect translation of tenses; another would render the proper names uniformly alike; another would correct the rendering of 'devils,' and introduce 'demons' and 'demoniacs,' as well as 'proconsuls,' 'magians,' and the 'rebels called Sicarii,' and banish such words as 'publicans,' which we have uncritically introduced. Messiah would be substituted for Christ by some, and Jehovah for LORD; while all would agree that the article should be correctly expressed. Obsolete expressions are objected to by most advocates for change; but 'obsolete' is not defined; over-literal translation is opposed by one, over-free by another. In all cases of this kind, which are matters of degree, it is well-nigh impossible to draw a line which shall be fixed and determinate.

Let any person or persons well acquainted with the Greek language take a few verses of an Epistle and begin to correct the English, so as to make it represent the original as precisely as they can, and it will be seen how difficult it is exactly to draw the line, and to say how far we are to go; and if they continue it, they will find the wish for change grow on them. And if, which is the only limit we can see, we go on to make the new version as perfect as possible, what becomes of the 'few' or 'slight' changes we hear of—of the retention of our old version—or of the prospect of the general acceptance of the new? We wish the difficulties of the subject to be considered; and the inconsistencies of those who speak of the changes as slight, or of the new version with those slight changes being generally acquiesced in as final. There are two lines to take: (i.) The correcting of what is clearly wrong in our version in material points, if it can be decided what is clearly better, which is really sometimes difficult: (ii.) the making a version as perfect as possible, only retaining, as far as may be, the rhythm and phraseology of the

present version. Either of these lines is intelligible, though indeterminate: between these two there is every conceivable degree of change possible.

And how are we to gain any unity of view about them?

It is obvious that one of the most difficult questions on which to obtain an unity of opinion, is the degree to which the *language* of a new version should depart from that of the old; or, if the expression be preferred, the extent to which the language of the received version should be corrected or improved. Every degree of variation is possible; and it is of the utmost importance that we should know what is to be done, or have great confidence in those who have to do it, before we encourage the undertaking of such a work. Since the affectionate reverence of our people for the Authorized Version makes a proposal for the introduction of a new one utterly impractical, all that is suggested is the correction of the old. And, no doubt, almost every person, even among the unlearned, has a view that the present version may be improved; but where are we to stop? Let us see the different stages in the road. Each knows something that could be altered for the better. There are expressions which shock our delicacy, and which clergymen avoid reading when they occur in the lessons. Why should not these be corrected? There are obsolete expressions, of which the Edinburgh reviewer enumerates 'ouches,' 'taches,' 'habergeon,' 'brigandine,' 'knops,' 'neesings,' 'mufflers,' 'wimples'—many of them good Shaksperian words, but of an unknown tongue to us now—which people think might as well be represented by words of known meaning. Then there are old phrases which convey a different idea from what they did formerly: as 'take no thought,' meaning, be not anxious; 'let,' meaning, to hinder; 'prevent,' meaning, to help beforehand. Again, 'publicans,' 'offend,' and 'offences,' would need alteration. Nay, it seems that 'pitiful,' in the sense of 'full of pity,' that sweetest of words, offends the modern mind of the Edinburgh reviewer; and in Mr. Stanley's translation, S. Paul 'regrets' when he used to 'be sorry;' and 'of,' and 'after,' and 'by,' in the senses of 'by,' 'according to,' or 'after the pattern of,' and 'near,' are objected to. It is plain that we may go on in this line indefinitely far, till we have modernised our whole version, and reduced it, not to the standard of pure classical English, but to that of the town populations of the present year. We say 'the town populations,' because (as is very well known to all who have experience among our poor, or even our middle classes) the English of the country—laying aside all provincialisms—and the English of the towns, are very different. The language of tracts made for the one is wholly unsuited to the other. The town language is book

English. Classes have risen up whose language and ideas are formed, not by the intercourse of society, but by newspapers and books. And they talk in a way which would be unintelligible to our Saxon-speaking countrymen, calling 'round' things 'circular,' and talking of the 'altitude' of a hill, or the 'profundity' of a valley. Now, first, in its general characteristics, and specially in its prepositions, the language of the Bible is still the language of a very large part of our people. It is not the language of refined West-end congregations, but it is the language of the rustic, Bible-reading poor. Secondly, even when it has become obsolete, it is traditionally known and understood. It is the Bible phraseology, and familiar to us as such; and we apprehend that the meaning of its antiquated expressions—its 'of,' 'after,' 'by'—is better understood by people generally, than the new phraseology of our towns would be by our rustics. Of course there are exceptions: 'to be zealously affected' is, probably, generally understood to mean, 'to be zealous,' whereas it means, to be the object of zealous desire; perhaps, 'is preferred before me' may be often wrongly understood, 'is chosen in preference to me;' and 'will' and 'would,' as representing *θέλειν*, create a wrong impression. We know this when we reflect; we forget it as we read. But we conceive that some ambiguities are almost unavoidable: and it is very difficult, indeed, to find any brief English expressions preferable to those we have, as may be seen by the various attempts to improve 'offend,' or 'offences' in translation.

But to go further; there is another point in which the language of our version has been objected to,—that is, its word-for-word adherence to the original. Thus Selden is cited by the Edinburgh reviewer:—

"There is no book," says that learned man, "so translated as the Bible for the purpose. If I translate a French book into English, I turn it into English phrase and not into French-English. '*Il fait froid*,' I say, 'It is cold,' not 'It makes cold;' but the Bible is rather translated into English words, than into English phrase. The Hebraisms are kept, and the phrase of that language is kept; which is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it; but when it comes among the common people, Lord, what gear do they make of it!"

But we apprehend that there is a change since Selden's time, and that whilst particular words, then familiar, have become obsolete, the expressions of Scripture, thus literally derived from the Hebrew, have become familiar, almost proverbial. So the Edinburgh reviewer complains that these phrases 'bewilder the understanding of the reader,' and, we presume, would substitute the interpretation for the literal translation; as in the instance he gives—for 'a covenant of salt,' 'a friendly contract;' for—we still follow Mr. Harness—"they are crushed in the gate,"

'they are found guilty in a court of justice;' for 'branch and root,' 'the highest and lowest;' for 'the calves of our lips,' 'praises and thanksgivings;' for 'rising early,' 'acting with alacrity;' for 'I have given you cleanness of teeth,' 'extreme scarcity.' Now, first, we observe that no intelligent student of Scripture need have 'his understanding bewildered' by these expressions: their meaning is easily learnt, and may be noted in the margin of his Bible. Secondly, it belongs to the sacredness of Scripture that it should be translated as exactly and verbally as possible. Thirdly, the Edinburgh reviewer seems to have but little appreciation of the beauty or poetry of the Hebrew figures he would thus put out of our Bible. We apprehend that English people would not wish to have their Bibles revised on this principle: brief marginal explanations would remove every difficulty.

Another class would go further, and, like Newcome, adopt different terms from those used in our received theological vocabulary, as expressing the original more precisely; they would thus revolutionise our Scripture phraseology under the view of mirroring to us more accurately the force of the original. Now there is here a very important consideration bearing on the language of the Bible, and that is, that it has become the language of English theology, and also of our practical and devotional religion, not only that of us who are living now, but of the whole of our older theological and religious literature. We can well imagine that there are those who would on that very account wish to see it altered; there is a rising and a growing school among us, who would wish to see the people's minds unsettled, and their established religious phraseology broken down. They say that we rest in words instead of ideas; that if we were any of us compelled to abstain from using the words we are accustomed to, and to express ourselves in different, in common, terms—if we were to translate our religious statements into the language of ordinary life—it would clear our views, brush away cobwebs, destroy *idola*; enable us to be rational Christians, instead of merely repeating the (to us) unmeaning phraseology of bygone and worn-out theologies. We cannot doubt that such a school would gain by such a process, but it would be at the cost of the religion of the English people; because, useful and profitable as it is for us thus to place doctrines and religious sentiments in new lights, there are very few indeed who possess the capacity for doing it, as is plain enough from the fact that in becoming philosophical Christians, they do but change their vocabulary; and if the received Christian language be to them individually as unmeaning as a tinkling cymbal, still more so is that of the

liberal and philosophical religion which they adopt. Men must have an established phraseology; and to argue from this that their belief and sentiments are unreal, is altogether incorrect; because the mind and heart interpret and rightly understand many a well-known Christian expression which the intellect unaccustomed to such exercise cannot analyse, or the unpractised tongue explain. That such breaking down of old associations is an object with the 'liberal' advocates of a revision of our Authorized Version, we believe it is no want of truth or charity to affirm.

But, addressing ourselves to those who do not wish for such a result, we would remind them how intimate is the connexion between our religious vocabulary—nay, that of our history and our literature—with the Authorized Version; the language of the Bible has become the language of faith and devotion, and we refer, and justly refer, to the Bible as affording a sanction for our belief and our prayers.

But we shall be told, no one wishes to alter the general phraseology of the Bible. We reply, probably none profess to wish it—probably few do really wish it; but when once persons begin to make our version strictly represent the original, it will be alleged, that other expressions more precisely correspond to that original; and 'mystery,' 'atonement,' 'regeneration,' and 'grace,' may no longer be found in our Bibles. What would be the consequence of thus severing the received expressions of Christian truth from the language of the people's Bible, so that we should hear no echo in one to the other? Let this be well considered, and most by those who regard it as chimerical. All we wish to press is the danger of alteration, except on principles most exactly laid down, and in hands that the Church—nay, we suppose, we may say the religious people of England—can confide in.

The like may be said of the *matter* of our translation. Correct all that is certainly wrong. Well, all would admit that this should be done, but let any one of the advocates for revision take a chapter of the New Testament, and point out what is meant by 'certainly wrong.' 'Certainly,' we presume, must be understood to mean in the unanimous judgment of competent scholars. It is true, though it be paradoxical to say it, that it is impossible for any translation not to be in some respects 'certainly wrong;' and that not by oversight or ignorance on the part of the translator, but by the very nature of the work itself. The translator is conscious that his version is 'certainly wrong,' but he is obliged to leave it so, because one language cannot exactly and correctly represent the ideas expressed in another.

On this point we may take Mr. Ellicott's classification of the

respects in which he has tried to correct the Authorized Version. These are, where it was *incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obsolete*. Now, if *incorrect* means a blunder (the Greek meaning one thing and the English another), let us ask, how many such incorrectnesses are there in our version? Allow that 'Ye see how large a letter I have written to you with mine own hand,' should be, 'Ye see in how large letters I have written unto you with mine own hand:' or to take the instances given by Mr. Stanley, that 'cōming' is put for 'revelation'—being, in fact, the interpretation instead of the translation of the word; 'JESUS CHRIST' for Christ Jesus, and the omission of 'our;' or in 1 Pet. v. 3, 'Neither as lording it over God's heritage,' which ought to be, 'Neither as lording it over your portions (of Christ's flock);' or 'not slothful in business,' 'not slack in exerting yourselves,'—for Mr. Heywood, when he instanced this as an error of our Authorized Version, made as great a blunder himself by translating *σπουδῇ* 'zeal;' for 'not slothful in business,' *i. e.* in whatever you exert or busy yourself, is not far removed from *τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί*. Let such passages, it will be said, be corrected. But are we to stop here? There is one large class of words on which questions of correctness will at once arise, and indeed has arisen. The Baptists of America wish to translate *βαπτίζω*, 'to immerse;' the honorary secretary of the Anglo-Biblical Institute would translate *ἐκκλησία*, 'congregation;' *ἐπίσκοπος*, 'overseer;' *διάκονος*, 'attendant.' Of course, we have no doubt that they are wrong; each of these terms as used in the New Testament had a technical or ecclesiastical, as well as a common meaning. We speak of the 'washings' (not the immersions) of pots; of our Lord not having 'washed' before dinner. But when S. John came, he came performing a rite which was indeed designated by a word that had a common as well as an 'ecclesiastical' or technical sense. Our word 'immerse,' or 'wash,' has not that twofold sense, and accordingly we must use two English words to represent the one Greek word. So we translate *ἐκκλησία* 'an assembly,' when we speak of the *ἐκκλησίας* of the Greeks at Ephesus, but rightly express it by a word to which a sacred sense is attached when it refers to the Christian society, or its meetings. And why? Why, because the Greek word *ἐκκλησία* was seized on to represent the Hebrew *קָהָל*, and *קָהָל* was a sacred word, applied to the people of Israel considered as God's privileged and blessed people: and whereas, in the Old Testament, the *ἐκκλησία Κυρίου* means the ancient Israel, our Saviour Himself placed His new people in a corresponding relation to Himself when He said, 'On this rock I will build My *ἐκκλησία*, My Church;' so of *ἐπίσκοπος* and *διάκονος*, it is plain that they are sometimes used in their common sense, as

'overseer' and 'attendant;' but it is plain that they had also acquired, like *πρεσβύτερος*, an official sense in the apostolic age, and that they are so used by the writers of the New Testament. Here it is plain that a wide field for disputation will be opened to the 'correctors' of the Authorized Version; and it is very possible that if the appointed correctors did not in these respects meet the views of dissenting bodies, that they would take advantage of a change in the old Bible to introduce new Bibles of their own. This at least is a very grave consideration, and it ought to be well weighed, and such consequences guarded against.

But to pass from these questions of incorrectness. Are we to place under this head, and are we to consider as subjects for correction, such inaccuracies as Professor Scholefield pointed out in his *Considerations*? or such as Mr. Stanley says form the chief heads needing correction: (i.) the inaccurate representation of the tenses; (ii.) the want of regard to the presence or absence of the article; (iii.) the want of consistency in using the same Greek words for the same English ones, or *vice versâ*? That accuracy in these respects greatly adds to the clearness, the vividness, the beauty of a version, there can be no doubt, *e.g.* in the narrative of the miracle, S. Luke v. 1. &c. But are they among the points on which the translation should be corrected? Most scholars unquestionably would answer, Yes. But caution must be used in taking the opinion of so-called scholars. First, they are anxious to express in English every shade of meaning that is indicated in the original. It is the perfection of a translation to do so, provided you do not thereby sacrifice the idiom, the clearness, the simplicity of the translation. But in a translation of the Scriptures intended for general use, the unlearned being the greater part, the simplicity, ease, and perspicuity of the version are of the utmost importance. The scholar, however, is apt to overlook this. His great object, in his version, is to reflect the original as perfectly as possible—as perfectly, if it might be, as the still lake represents the rocks and mountains that surround it—and he is apt to forget his reader. In the Greek he has the key to the meaning of his own English, and it is very difficult to put himself in the position of a person who has no such key; or to imagine the possible or probable misunderstandings to which his version may give occasion. The scholar's work ought to be revised, if it is to become the version for the use of all classes, by a committee of *common sense*.

Secondly, on the points we have just mentioned, and others like them, there is a further danger to which professed scholars are particularly exposed, that of over-straining their own theories.

When a view is new, when it is the supposed discovery of the day, it engages a very undue amount of belief and attention. The scholar, like other men, is influenced by fashion; and if the fashion be for great accuracy, and there is a new theory, which is not old enough to have had its truth yet tested, he will be likely to be ever introducing it.

However, these very points are themselves in many respects debateable ground. The force of the aorist, as compared with the perfect (though quite clear in classical Greek), is not yet settled in the language of the New Testament. It seems even now to be the subject of controversy among scholars; and we apprehend that ultimately it will be allowed, at least, that the writers of the New Testament use perfects, where classical Greek writers would have used the aorist, as in *οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν*; further, that in particular verbs the perfect form had taken the place of the aorist, as in *ἐώρακα*; and, perhaps, that aorists are used where Attic writers would have used perfects—*e.g.* in the simple statement, *Δάζαρος ἀπέθανεν*, the classic word clearly would have been *τέθνηκε*. On this and other subjects the New Testament grammar is in a transition state, and it is most necessary to guard against applying the rules of Attic Greek to the interpretation of the Hellenistic. Besides the investigation of Syriac, the modern Greek should be studied, because the language of some, at least, of the writers of the New Testament is the provincial spoken Greek of their day; not the Greek of the educated, as it is preserved in the later classical writers, but the vulgar tongue of the day, which was the early element of the Romain; just as the Romance languages of the West represent the colloquial Latin of the humbler classes in Italy or the provinces. Hence the nice distinctions of Attic Greek may not hold good in the New Testament.

Scholars, however, lay much stress on classical distinctions, and feel obliged to mark them; and, accordingly, they mis-translate, because the ordinary English idiom requires us to use our 'have,' where the Greeks used the aorist—for instance, in speaking of recent events, 'I have seen your father'—*i.e.* have just now seen him: or in negative prepositions, 'No one has written so well as he:' or where we speak of a past action as a kind of possession of ours, as of some exploit or rare deed—'I have been on the summit of Mont Blanc;' 'I have sailed three times round the world;' 'I have conversed with Napoleon.' All these past tenses would be expressed by aorists in Greek. And though it is possible so to frame the sentence as in most, if not in all cases, to avoid the 'have,' yet it is not natural to do so. In teaching boys to construe, we admire Dr. Kennedy's rule of never allowing them to translate an

aorist by 'have;' but the object of construing is to learn the Greek idiom; that of translating, to express the Greek thought in English idiom—and the scholar's crotchet must give way to the reader's use; because the consequence of strictly adhering to this rule is to destroy the force of the Greek; for instance, when aorists are combined with presents—'Now ye are full; 'now ye *were* rich (*ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε*), without us ye reigned as 'kings: for I think God set forth us the apostles last, as it 'were appointed unto death; for we were made a spectacle 'unto the world, and to angels, and to men. We are fools for 'Christ's sake,' &c.

We submit that the wish to be accurate in translating the aorist has destroyed the sense and the force of the words in English; our usage requiring 'are rich,' 'hath set forth,' 'we have been made,' though the Greek usage introduced the aorist. Again, there is an anomaly when perfects and aorists are combined, as in 1 John i. 1, thus translated by the American Bible Union:—'What was from the beginning, what we have heard' (*ἀκηκόαμεν*), what we have seen with our eyes (*εὐράκαμεν*), 'what we gazed upon (*ἐθεασάμεθα*), and our hands handled' (*ἐψηλά φησαν*). Mr. Malan has rightly pointed out that *εὐράκαμεν* is used for an aorist, and perhaps *ἀκηκόαμεν*. We should prefer translating all of them 'have,' as laying a stress on the fact, though we admit that a scholar could see the beauty of 'what we (in times past) gazed on, and our hands handled.'

The subject of the Article, again, is full of difficulties, and though there are many places in which great force and clearness are added to the words by its being regarded, there are others where the rules for its presence or absence are undecided among scholars. The cases where it may be omitted are not settled. It appears to have given great trouble to the American Bible Union, as one of their 'revisers'—specimens of whose unfinished work were published and fell into Dr. Cumming's hands—had translated, 'He that immerseth in a Holy Spirit;' and Mr. Norton says, in defending them, though we do not put him forward as any authority, that—

'Bishop Middleton's view as to the use of the Greek article, to distinguish the Person from the influence of the Holy Spirit, has contributed to some of the reviser's errors. To one person the subject seemed sufficiently important to lead him to prepare and forward to the American Bible Union a critical analysis of the usage of the whole New Testament in reference to Bishop Middleton's views on that point.'—*Norton's Letters to the Times*, p. 7.

Without setting the least value on Mr. Norton or his friend's opinion on this point, it is evident that this subject runs into great difficulties; and it would be a mistake indeed to 'correct' the Authorized Version in doubtful places.

Thirdly, the Authorized Version is said to be in fault because

it does not adhere, as uniformly as it ought to do, to translating the Greek words by the same corresponding English words. There is no doubt that the translators were faulty in this respect. They seemed to enjoy varying their English. However, they justify this in their preface; first, from a wish to depart as little as possible from previous versions; secondly, in order to give as many words as they could the opportunity of having a place in their version.

Thus the very same Greek passage, as Archbishop Newcome has noted, is rendered differently in different places: 'He that is not against us is on our side,' (S. Matt. xii. 30,) but 'is for us,' (S. Luke ix. 50.) 'Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak,' (S. Matt. xxvi. 41.) But the very same Greek words in S. Mark xiv. 38 are translated, 'Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation: the spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak.' So in the very same passage, Gen. xv. 6, as quoted Rom. iv. 3, Gal. iii. 6, James ii. 23, *ἐλογίσθη* is rendered by three different words, 'counted,' 'accounted,' 'imputed:' *κράτιστος* occurs four times; twice it is rendered 'most excellent,' when applied to Theophilus; twice 'most noble,' applied to Felix and Festus; *πατρία* occurs three times; it is rendered by 'family,' 'lineage,' and 'kindred;' *ἀναστατώω* occurs three times; it is rendered by 'to turn upside down,' 'to make an uproar,' 'to trouble.' So *μαρτυρέω* and its substantives are indiscriminately rendered 'record,' 'witness,' 'testimony'—words which in our day have different meanings. The reader is needlessly puzzled in some places, as in John ii. where 'the ruler of the feast,' and 'the governor of the feast,' seem to be two different persons; in others he loses sight of the connexion of the thought and argument in the original. The Edinburgh reviewer, borrowing from Mr. Stanley, points out how *παράκλησις* is translated almost indiscriminately 'comfort,' 'console,' 'beseech,' 'entreat,' 'desire,' 'exhort,' as in 2 Cor. i. 3—5, where the force of the passage mainly depends on the recurrence of precisely the same word. It is a great fault thus to vary the translation without cause, but with cause it is the greatest excellence. The Greek words have various shades of meaning—one best expressed by one English word, another by another; and it is one of the very highest excellences of a translator to vary his English words accordingly. But what is the result of Mr. Stanley's rule. Why, *νήπιος* he translates 'a babe,' and keeps 'child' for *τέκνον*, and 'little child' for *παιδιον*; he also translates *καταργεῖσθαι*, very incorrectly, 'to vanish away.' Accordingly, he renders a well-known verse, 'When I was a babe, I spake as a babe, I understood as a babe, I thought

'as a babe; when I am become a man (γέγονα), I have made 'the things of a babe to vanish away.' 'When I am become a man,' is an awkward attempt to express the perfect, and comes under a former observation, the attempting to express the shades of meaning in the Greek tenses by un-English idioms: 'now that I am become a man,' would give what is required. But 'babes' do not speak at all, nor understand, nor think (ἐλογίζομην is the Greek word); nor is the being a *babe* naturally contrasted with becoming a *man*; so that over-accuracy in the translation of νήπιος introduces inconsistency in the passage, and really destroys much of its force. We need not observe on its general awkwardness. So in 1 Cor. iii. 2, to avoid the 'obsolete' English 'meat' used for solid food generally, which the Edinburgh reviewer complains of, Mr. Stanley translates it 'food,' and we have in consequence, 'I gave you milk and not food.' Now, 'milk' is 'food.' This would hold in the use of 'meat and drink,' in S. John vi. In another place, in order to translate χάρις uniformly 'grace,' we have (2 Cor. ii. 14), 'Now grace unto God, which always leadeth us in triumph;' in the margin, 'or thanks.' It is true we say 'grace' before and after meals, but this scarcely justifies such a usage; and how would it hold in S. Luke, 'If ye love them that love you, what grace have ye?' Again, there is the following very unhappy rendering produced by the same attempt (1 Cor. vii. 39), 'The wife is bound as long 'as her husband liveth; but *if her husband be fallen asleep*, she is 'free to be married to whom she will.' It would be very beautiful, if 'to fall asleep' suggested death as naturally to us as it did to the first Christians.

We ought to say, after having taken these instances from Mr. Stanley's translation, that he guards us against supposing that he suggests these minute changes 'as necessary or desirable for any general use of the English translation.' And several of his suggestions and corrections are of value. But they illustrate our meaning as to the risks of revising our version, both by showing how doubtful is the ground we come into, and how easy it is to spoil our present version: his translation shows also numerous places uncorrected, which need correction as much as those that are altered.

¹ καταργεῖσθαι means 'to be made,' or 'become useless'; it does not involve at all the idea of destruction, but of a thing becoming obsolete, being superseded, no longer of any use or importance. Hence it is, in 1 Cor. xiii., most beautifully applied to the superseding of the earthly by the heavenly. Prophecy or preaching shall become useless; when that which is perfect is come, that which is partial is superseded—is of no use—and is thrown aside as valueless. When I became a man I put aside my childish thoughts, views, words. Again, the law καταργηται ἐν Χριστῷ, is made useless or forceless, being not destroyed, but superseded by the Gospel.

Again, the same English word is used to represent very different Greek words: as 'hell,' for both Hades and Gehenna; damnation, for κρίμα and κατὰ κρίμα; and the like: especially is this the case in the neglect of the distinction between εἶναι and γίνεσθαι, which is not unfrequently found in the Authorized Version. But here the point is overstrained by revisers. It is very important, in order to teach learners of Greek to distinguish these words, to oblige them to construe them by different English words, and to see the force of each. But in a translation intended for general use, the English idiom must be regarded rather than the exact expression of the Greek word. Now, in English we say 'be,' where the Greek usage was to say 'become.' 'Be thou faithful unto death;' 'Be ye not as the hypocrites:' γίνου and γίνεσθε are used in the Greek; and our modern scholars would wish to express this in the English. And so Mr. Stanley has—'*Become* not servants of men;' 'neither *become* ye idolaters' (1 Cor. x. 7); and, 'Brethren, *become* not little children in mind; howbeit in malice be ye babes, but in mind *become* perfect' (1 Cor. xiv. 20). Yet he retains (1 Cor. iv. 16, and xi. 1), 'Be ye followers of me,' and, 'Be ye steadfast, unmoveable' (1 Cor. xv. 58). But Mr. Ellicott uniformly has 'become,' as Gal. iv. 12, 'Brethren, *become* as I am, for I am *become* as ye are;' and Eph. iv. 32, 'and *become* kind one to another, tender-hearted,' &c.; v. 1, '*Become* therefore followers of God, as dear children;' v. 7, '*Become* not therefore partakers with them;' v. 17, 'Do not *become* unwise.' These are over-refinements; in all these cases the proper—that is, the natural idiomatic—English, is 'be;' and the attempt to express the Greek precisely conveys a false notion to the English reader.

It may be well to consider what attempts have been recently made in this way, that we may see what prospect there is either of unanimity on the principles or details of a revision, or of any great improvement being made by it, unless it be conducted with the greatest caution.

In making these criticisms, we ought to say that whilst we would repress the presumption of sciolists, we should be sorry, indeed, to throw any hindrance or discouragement in the way of those who labour in so great and glorious a work as presenting the Holy Scriptures in the most perfect form possible to our countrymen. We sympathise fully with Professor Selwyn; nay, we would desire, if it could be obtained safely, even more than he suggests; but we see much need of caution as to those by whom the work is to be done, and the principles on which it is done; and, still more, we see the utmost difficulty in securing any unanimous reception of a corrected version. We should

desire such a version so accurate and good, as that it might last without needing change for some hundred years to come. But could such a version be brought to general acceptance?

We regret to have to allude to differences, or to anything which might cause severance among those who would be anxious to promote such a work, but we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that all have not the same object.

In 1840 a revision of the Authorized Version appeared, made from the text of Griesbach; appended to it, at the foot of each page, are the renderings adopted by others. A second edition was called for, and a third this year; and Mr. Samuel Sharpe, its editor, has sent out, in a separate form, 'Critical Notes,' giving the reasons of his translations. The doctrinal bias of the translator is evident enough. For instance, in John v. we have:—'Wherefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He had not only broken the sabbath, but had also said 'that God was His Father, making Himself like God.' 'His,' it is noticed in the note, is translated 'His own,' by Boothroyd; but this is not taken into the text, though the Greek is *ἰδιος*; whilst Newcome's 'like' is substituted for 'equal,' when the Greek is *ἴσος*. So again at the beginning of the same Gospel, 'by Him were all things made,' is rendered, 'by it,' *i. e.* the Logos, because, forsooth, the 'personality of the Logos is not declared till the 14th verse:' while Origen's indifferent criticism is alleged in explanation of Θεός being without an article, as showing the *possibility* of understanding the word when predicated of the Logos in a lower sense. The scholarship of the translator is not particularly good, as may appear from his altering '*is* preferred before me,' John i. 15, 30, to '*was* preferred before me,' the Greek word being γέγονεν. ὅτι πρῶτος μου ἦν, he understands, 'was my superior.' ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, 'in holy spirit,' (Mark xii. 36,) instead of in *the*: the preposition accounts for the absence of the article. οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, (Mark viii. 33,) 'Thou art not thinking of the things of God.' The writer retains such words as didrachma, stater, denarius, sicarii. He translates ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ, 'They found a difficulty in Him'—elsewhere the word or its cognates is rendered otherwise; 'If thine eye cause thee to sin;' 'Woe to the world because of *sins*.' Of course many of the corrections made are what any one engaged in such a work at the present day could not but make, if tolerably well informed or acquainted with what others had done; but the special characteristics of it are bad, both in scholarship and in the doctrinal or anti-doctrinal bias of the editor.

We need not dwell longer on this work, though its general

retention of the language of our version contrasts favourably with the next version before us; that is, a new translation of the Epistles of S. Paul, by Joseph Turnbull, Ph. D. the honorary secretary to the Anglo-Biblical Institute. Dr. Turnbull tells us that he has been engaged in this work for six years; and in a wordy preface sets forth his view of the manner in which S. Paul's Epistles ought to be translated. He considers that they must have been quite plain and easy to the persons to whom they were addressed, and says that for some centuries they were popular reading, as in a sense they certainly are now. He appears not only to wish, but to believe, that if they were rightly translated, we should have 'the readable letters of the 'Apostle continuously, as letters should be read, without impediment, weariness, or hesitation.' (Pref. p. x.) Unfortunately, this unlucky word 'continuously,' belonging to nothing in the sentence, shows that when he is not translating, but writing his original thoughts, the honorary secretary's composition cannot be read without 'impediment' or 'hesitation;' and all attempt to go through his preface, to say nothing of his translation, will convince any one that his work cannot be read without weariness. Dr. Turnbull seems to think that the Epistles can be read in the original 'without impediment or hesitation.' If so, he is an object, shall we say, of envy or of pity? Does he not see the difficulties, or does he see through them? All we can say is, that the old Authorized Version more truly represents the Apostle's language, and can be read with much less of impediment, weariness, or hesitation, than Dr. Turnbull's version. A few brief specimens of the translation may show what it is:—

Eph. v. 32. 'This secret is important; I refer, however, to Messiah and to the congregation.'

Col. iii. 1. 'Enquire after things above. 2. Think most of those things above,' &c.

Col. ii. 18. 'Vainly inflated with the notion of his flesh.'

22. 'Injunctions, which are all detrimental by their improper use.'

23. 'Not to the credit of any one for personal appearance.'

1 Cor. x. 32. 'Be you *inoffensive* to Jews and Greeks, and also to the congregation of God: just as I comply with all in everything not seeking my own interest, but that *of the multitude*, that they may be saved.'

However, as heresy manifestly is the ruling spirit of Mr. Samuel Sharpe's translation, schism is that of Dr. Turnbull's; and we must remit our readers to Mr. Malan's annihilation of his arguments for using 'congregation,' 'overseer,' 'attendant,' instead of 'church,' 'bishop,' and 'deacon.'

We will pass on to translations recently published by men of position and name as scholars, though they only are of portions of Holy Writ.

Dr. Peile's translation of S. Paul's Epistles is professedly free:

it is entitled 'A New Translation of the Received Text of the Apostolical Epistles, slightly interpolated;' that is, it is somewhat paraphrastic, and seems to be a confession of the difficulty of conveying the full sense of the original, *as understood by the translator*, except by a paraphrase. The first words of the Epistle to the Romans will give an idea of the translation. We retain Dr. Peile's capitals and italics as exactly as we can:—

'Paul, a servant of JESUS CHRIST, a called Apostle, set apart to publish glad tidings from GOD, of which He had given promise aforetime by His Prophets in Holy Scriptures, concerning His SON—Who was of the seed of David, as manifested in the flesh; Whose being, *what* as appointed to be *He is now*, THE SON OF GOD PUTTING FORTH POWER IN THE MANIFESTATION OF THE SPIRIT OF HOLINESS, followed upon His rising from the dead, *from that Day to be made known as* JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD, through Whom we have received grace and Apostolic power to call forth the obedience of Belief in all nations, for His Name's sake; by which means are ye also among those whom JESUS CHRIST hath called,' &c.

We conceive that Dr. Peile has misapprehended the meaning of the Greek, and that 'in Holy Scriptures,' ought certainly to have been, 'in *the* Holy Scriptures.' But what we would draw attention to is, the limitation of the fulness of the Apostle's meaning produced by paraphrasing it; surely 'set apart for the 'gospel of God for the obedience of the faith among all 'nations,' is as intelligible, and certainly much more full of meaning, than Dr. Peile's paraphrase, which is a hindrance both to the reading and the understanding of the passage. Again:—

Rom. ii. 25. 'For that thou art a circumcised person, is a benefit doubtless, if there be a felt obligation of Law *to be seen* in thy practice; but if thou art an offender against felt obligation of Law, thy circumcision is no better than uncircumcision.'

Who would take this instead of the noble, simple, and intelligible words, 'For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep 'the law: but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision'? So we have, Rom. xii. 3, 'every individual member of your community,' for 'every one among you.'

But on other points Dr. Peile adheres to the Authorized Version; as (let Mr. Heywood observe it)—'In *your business*, 'far from being slothful, be fervent in spirit, as being the Lord's 'servants.'

And, Rom. xii. 2, we find *αἰών* translated 'world,' when 'age' would, we think, express it better. But we do not think this translation worth dwelling longer on.

Conybeare and Howson profess to give a paraphrastic translation in modern language. Accordingly we find many varia-

tions from the Authorized Version,—many which they themselves, on the excellent grounds which we cited above, would not wish to introduce into an Authoritative Version; and certainly they do often bring out in a very pleasing way the meaning of the Apostle. But we must be allowed to doubt the improvement, either in force, beauty, or clearness, of such a translation as this:—

1 Thess. v. 16—18. 'In every season keep a joyful mind; let nothing cause your prayers to cease; continue to give thanks whatever be your lot.'

It is also obvious to remark that in this place *καὶρὸς*, 'season,' is equivalent to 'circumstances.' There seems to be an attempt to bring out the force of the present imperative as indicating continuity, which, in our judgment, is overstrained.

So in 1 Cor. ix. 26, 27, we have a mixture of good and bad. 'I therefore run, not like the racer who is uncertain of his goal; I fight, not as the pugilist who strikes out against the air; but I bring my body into bondage, crushing it with heavy blows; lest perchance, having called others to the contest, I should myself fail shamefully of the prize.'

1 Cor. x. 1. 'But you, brethren, I call to remember our forefathers how they were all guarded by the pillar of the cloud, and all passed safely through the sea. And [as you were baptized unto Christ] they all, through the cloud and through the sea, were baptized unto Moses.'

For 'gospel,' we have 'glad tidings;' for 'preach the gospel,' 'proclaim the tidings;' gaining the idea conveyed by the original word; but losing its identity with all our associations.

Rom. xii. 11. 'Let your diligence be free from sloth; let your spirit glow with zeal; be true bondsmen of your Lord. In your hope be joyful; in your sufferings be steadfast; in your prayers be unwearied.' The article is expressed by the 'yours.' But here the paraphrase limits the original; the idea of 'patience' is lost in 'steadfastness,' when both, with 'perseverance,' seem implied in *προσκατεροῦντες*.

Many good hints may be obtained from this translation; and it is pretty and readable, but too modern. Its accuracy and exactness in representing S. Paul are often questionable.

We have already given many illustrations from Mr. Stanley's translation; we will only add one or two more.

'Why do ye not suffer unrighteous wrong?' *τί οὐ μᾶλλον ἀδικεῖσθε*; (1 Cor. vi. 7.) Can there be any 'wrong' which is 'not unrighteous?' If there be a fault in the English, it lies not in the 'wrong,' but the 'suffer,' which is quite liable to be understood in the sense of allowing persons to do wrong: 'why do ye not rather endure to be wronged?'

Or what is there, in the whole range of faults in the English version, equal to this? (1 Cor. vii. 39.) 'The wife is bound as long as her husband liveth; but if her husband *be fallen asleep*, she is free to be married to whom she will.'

What need will there be for expositions on the part of the parochial clergy, to show to their poor people, from other parallel passages, from the immediate context, and from the nature of the case, that 'a husband falling asleep,' in the common sense of the words, does not set his wife free to marry some one else! But the Greek is *ἐκοιμήθη*. True, but to 'fall asleep' is not in the English idiom used for death: among the Greeks and the early Christians it was.

By way of contrast to Mr. Stanley, Mr. Samuel Sharpe says that 'and when he' (Stephen) 'had said this he fell asleep,' should be, 'he went to his rest,' 'he died.'

Again, 'With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's day.'

But one of the chief faults of this translation is the want of consistency. If these corrections are made, how many others ought to be? Mr. Stanley seems to correct or not, almost indiscriminately. The aorist, the article, the want of uniformity in translating the Greek words by the same English, are what he most thinks of. Thus he corrects what needs no correction, and he omits to correct what really needs it: as, (1 Cor. iv. 6,) 'that no one of you (*ἵνα μὴ εἰς*) be puffed up;' it means, 'that ye be not puffed up, each for the one against the other.'

1 Cor. vii. 21. 'But if thou canst be made free;' 'but *even* if,' *εἰ καὶ*, or rather, 'nay, even if,' &c.

Mr. Jowett, on the contrary, has made very few alterations indeed in our version. In the whole of his corrected version of the Epistle to the Galatians there are but fifty-one, of which twenty-six arise from his adopting a different reading in the Greek; twenty-five from corrections of the translation. These, from the first two chapters, are a fair specimen of the whole:—

i. 6. 'Called you *in* the grace of Christ;' for our 'into.'

10. 'If I yet pleased men;' omitting 'for.' Var. Lect.

17. 'Neither went I to Jerusalem;' omitting 'up.' Var. Lect.

19. 'Cephas;' for 'Peter.' Var. Lect.

ii. 4. 'But because of the false brethren;' for our, 'and that because of,' &c.

6. 'Accepteth *not* man's person;' for our 'no man's.'

8. 'The same wrought;' for our 'worketh.'

11. 'Cephas;' for 'Peter.' Var. Lect.

'He had incurred blame;' for 'he was to be blamed.'

14. 'Now compelled those;' for 'why,' &c. Var. Lect.

The most important alterations in the remaining part of this Epistle are:—

iv. 17, 18. 'They zealously *entreat* you;' and 'to be zealously *entreated*;' for our 'affect,' 'affected.'

v. 12. 'They would even cut off their members.'

17. 'So that ye *may* not do the things that ye would.'

vi. 11. 'See in what a large letter I have written to you,' &c.

But in the Epistle to the Romans we have iii. 25 rendered thus: 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith, *by His blood*, to declare His righteousness, because of the *'letting go* of sins that are past.'

ix. 6. 'God who is over all is blessed for ever.'

From these writers, whose merits do not lie in exactness of thought or of expression, we pass to Mr. Ellicott, who has with great judgment devoted himself chiefly to the grammatical interpretation of the Epistles, and has done his work really well. We will take a passage from his translation of the Epistle to the Ephesians, one familiar to us all—giving the words of the Authorized Version over the corresponding words of Mr. Ellicott's:—

desire that ye faint not

'Wherefore I *entreat* you *not* to lose heart at my tribulations for you, which
inasmuch as it is your glory. For this cause I bow my knees unto the
the whole family
Father (of our Lord Jesus Christ), from whom every race in heaven
and on earth is (thus) named, that He would grant you, according to the
by
riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might, through his Spirit, into
the inner man; so that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith,
that ye being
ye having been rooted and grounded in love, that ye may be fully able to comprehend with all saints what (is) the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might
may be filled up to all the fulness of God. Now unto Him that is able to
exceedingly abundantly above all that
do beyond all things, superabundantly beyond what we ask or think, according to his power that worketh in us, unto Him (be) glory in the church in
throughout all ages, world without end.
Christ Jesus, to all the generations of the age of the ages. Amen.'

The words which we have enclosed in parentheses () are printed in italics by Mr. Ellicott, being additions to the original.

On the variations of translation in this passage we have to observe (v. 15), that Mr. Ellicott determines needlessly, we think, the meaning of the Greek in *αἰτούμαι*. The English, 'I desire that ye faint not,' might mean either 'I ask of God,' or 'I ask of you.' The latter is much the most probable, as it is the natural, meaning of the Greek; still this is not

determined. '*Which is your glory*' is an exact translation of the Greek; Mr. Ellicott interprets, and in doing so diminishes the force of the original. '*That ye faint not,*' we like better than '*not to lose heart.*' '*The Father (of our Lord JESUS CHRIST);*' these words are excluded from the text, though undoubtedly ancient, and supported by a fair array of manuscripts and versions: in such a case, we should think, whatever critical editors may be bound to do, the Church would not be justified in excluding a clause.

Other alterations we think over-refinements.* They do, indeed, more exactly represent the Greek, but they make the English less simple, and, as it seems to us, do not convey that representation much more exactly to an English reader's mind. The sense of the Greek is conveyed quite as effectually in the old version as by the more precise expressions of the new: '*into*' expresses the *eis*, but to an English reader it suggests the idea, not of the Spirit's strength coming into the inner man, but of a person being strengthened so as to be converted into the inner man: '*so that*' determines what the original leaves open,—the simple '*that*' would be understood naturally in the same sense as '*so that,*' and has the advantage of expressing the indefiniteness of the Greek: the inversion of the '*that ye*' is only puzzling to an English reader, and the meaning of the two is the same: '*having been,*' it is questionable whether '*being*' does not better express the perfect than '*having been;*' certainly it expresses the presentness of that tense: '*fully able,*' *ἐξισχύσητε*; probably the *ἐξ* adds this force, but what is delicately indicated by the Greek preposition is brought out much too prominently by '*fully able,*'—we think the simple '*able*' more near the original: '*may*' is better than '*might,*' according to our present idiom: and '*filled with all the fulness,*' though it does not express the exact idea of *πληρωθῆτε eis*, does, perhaps, convey the Apostle's meaning to a simple English reader, as well as '*filled up to,*' which should rather be '*filled up into,*' or '*unto,*' to avoid the ambiguity of '*up to.*' Of the next passage Mr. Ellicott says,—'It does not seem necessary to refer *ὡν αἰτούμεθα* to *πάντα*; the second clause expresses more forcibly and specifically the sentiment of the first; this, however, is doubtful; but at any rate we like the old, '*exceedingly abundantly,*' better than '*superabundantly,*' and '*above*' than '*beyond.*' '*In*' is more exact than '*by;*' but the concluding alteration is made without any mercy for simple readers; at least we must think so of '*the age of the ages.*'

This passage is a fair specimen of what we mean by attempting to express in a translation too much of the refinements of the original. It certainly makes the translation less fitted for

simple readers. We should be inclined to say, let these be kept for the educated,¹ whose practised minds may be able to enter into refinements; or let them be reserved for paraphrases or expositions, where their full force could be brought out, without ambiguities; or let them be put in the margin.

The inference we may fairly deduce from all this is, that the state of *Biblical* scholarship, and of uniformity of view as to what a new version or revision should be, is scarcely such as lead us to have much hope of anything being gained by a revision on a large scale, or anything approaching to a new version, at present. It seems as if there was no line to be drawn as to where the alterations should stop; and if we promote a revision without strong assurance as to the parties by whom, and on the principles on which, it is to be made, we may only be encouraging at best crude—nay, it may be, heretical—attempts to corrupt the Sacred Word. We see how difficult it will be, if alterations are made, to satisfy those who now ask for them, but who probably are not at all agreed as to the extent to which they should go, from the hundred marginal corrections desired by Canon Selwyn to the new version of the Anglo-Biblical Institute. The abstract desirableness of corrections of our own version, nay, of a version as perfect as can be made, we fully assent to. But we wish to see our way as to what is proposed, and how it is to be done.

Besides this, it must not be forgotten that the advocates for a revision of our version would also wish for a *revision of the text* from which it is made. And this, we apprehend, is what the most forward of them would desire even more than the revision of the translation. The question is as to the duty of the Church in respect to the text to be followed, in case any revision were made.

Now, on this subject it is plain that many variations of text are such as would disappear in a translation. On the showing of critical editors themselves, a very large class of various readings belong only to the Greek inflections—the archaic or ungrammatical forms of the early copies being corrected: this was almost necessary when the Scriptures had to be read in Greek. The fact is only interesting as indicating the state of the language, and the want of literature in writers or copyists. The correction of these was something like the process adopted by Dr. Blayney, in removing the obsolete

¹ We find in Mr. Ellicott's new volume that he regards them as 'closet translations;' and for this purpose, to one who can read them with the Greek, they are very valuable.

forms from our version. Another class arise from insertion of particles, where the original is asyndetous, and from simplifications of constructions. These also must often be disregarded in any version which is to be generally and easily understood; the version must almost necessarily do what the ancient revisers of the text did,—must make it intelligible. The most important remain: and here a distinction must be drawn between a text as represented by critics, and as used by the Church. The Church receives a text traditionally; the received text has the presumption of possession: it requires, therefore, very strong evidence to alter what is so established, because there most probably were grounds for adopting the text used by the Church, which we cannot now ascertain. In a large class of instances, again, there is some evidence on both sides. Our readings are ancient readings, even if the preponderance of existing evidence show another reading to have obtained more generally in those days. In many instances critics are divided in opinion—nay, the same critic holds one view in one edition, and another in another. Again, so-called critics unfortunately do appear very often to be biassed against orthodox doctrine. Now the critic's text is put out, as it were, conjecturally. He undertakes to represent what appears from extant evidence, from early MSS., from versions, from citations in the Fathers, to have been the text received in early times—say, in the fourth century. But, in fact, there appear to have been great differences in the texts of those times. The Fathers themselves refer to these differences and discuss them: so that the truest way of representing the facts of the case would be to give several readings. The critic usually decides in favour of one, and the others, however probable they may be, are set aside. Besides, in critics, especially of late years, there is a tendency to depart from what is received; and the general acceptance of a reading in the many less ancient MSS. would not hold in their view against its not being the reading of the few more ancient. The principles on which the critic and the Church proceed are different. The probability that it is a correction, its being a more easy natural expression, condemns a reading. The critic says, This seems to have been the more general reading in the earlier ages. The Church says, This is the text we have received. Now we do not see why the two should not continue as distinct texts—at least while criticism can only speak uncertainly; and if any change were made by the Church in passages supposed to be interpolated, it should only be in some such way as was adopted by our translation in the verse 1 John ii. 23, where the latter portion of the verse is printed in italics, and one word put between brackets. In the same way 1 John v. 7, 8, on the Heavenly Witnesses;

was printed in a different type in Tyndale and Cranmer's translations. But this should only be done where there is very strong evidence indeed. It does not seem right for the Church to reject any portion of what may, in even a low degree of probability, be a part of the Divine Word. It is better to retain than to reject. The Church's Bible is the Bible she has received—the monument of the sacred text, as it has been read for a thousand years. It may be left to critics, or antiquarians, or controversialists, to say what evidence there is for any portion of this text not being genuine. If it be clearly understood that the Church's text is what has for so long been the received text, we do not see any falsity implied in her continuing to use it. We say this on the view that the received text does not teach anything untrue; holding that the most important texts in controversy do but express what is taught in other parts of Scripture; and that when there is uncertainty, it is right to retain the text that we have received. In this respect the Church must be content to bear the reproach of being behind the age. But we may well wait awhile till critics have arrived at some more settled views as to correct readings.

We have not as yet said anything of the danger of unsettling the minds of our people by varieties of versions. We do not underrate the possible danger, but we think it right to consider some few points.

First, so far as such things may unsettle them, they are exposed to this at present, from the oft-repeated assertion that our text and Authorized Version are incorrect. It is a very obvious and common argument for a sceptic to use to a simple-minded Christian, who rests on his English Bible as his guide, to say—Your Bible notoriously contains errors of translation. The fact will be mentioned that there have been shown to be ten thousand errors in the Protestant Bible; or that within the last few years a Bible was published containing 'twenty thousand corrections of the Authorized Version.' We have ourselves known instances where this very objection was made among educated people. A religious person who had relied very simply on the Authorized Version was much unsettled by it. People who hold loose notions about future punishment, or our blessed Lord's Nature or work, are very apt to allege generally that our version is confessedly incorrect. On this account we cannot but think that it would be an advantage to have a translation made by scholars of acknowledged fitness, *whether authorized or not*, which might be appealed to as representing the original as correctly as possible. Let every essential variation between that and the Authorized Version be noted, and there would

then be a ready and patent answer to any such objection. The value of this would be felt by many; though objections would be made still, and could not anyhow be prevented.

Again, even now almost all persons know that the Authorized Version is at least imperfect, and that it does not exactly or adequately, nay sometimes does not correctly, represent the original. There are very few churches in which, a few times at least in every year, the congregation do not hear from their clergyman that the original would be more correctly rendered in another way, or that the exact and full force of the Greek or Hebrew is somewhat different from what our version expresses. In some churches there is very much of this kind of correction of our version, and the educated laity appear to be fond of it. We can scarcely read any work of annotation of Scripture, or doctrine, or interpretation of prophecy, which does not continually remind us of this. The publication of the 'Annotated Paragraph Bible' of the 'Religious Tract Society,' at once disseminates corrections of the Authorized Version among all classes. There are works published to assist persons who do not know the original languages, in ascertaining the precise meanings of the words used. Indeed, a correction of the Authorized Version would render useless a large part of our 'Annotations,'—of parts, sometimes of the whole, of many sermons, and of the stock-in-trade of those who are always pointing out, in public or private, what the force of the original is, or the errors of our translation. And yet we do not find, for all this, that the faith of our people in their English Bibles is diminished, or that the general and indefinite knowledge that it is inexact or incorrect hinders their relying on it. So that it may be at least a fair question, whether the existence of a version recognised and circulated as an exact representation of the original, would not confirm the confidence of people in their Bibles by reducing to something like a definite certainty what is now a vague and undefined impression of incorrectness. Indeed the existence of two versions of the Psalms seems to decide the point. We believe that no one ever felt his faith the least shaken by this circumstance. And often as Protestant controversialists have alleged the numerous variations between the two 'perfectly correct' Vulgates of Sixtus and Clement, we do not apprehend that any Romanist would feel his faith in the least affected by it. In fact, common sense comes in and shows how immaterial these variations are.

Indeed, our condition with a settled canon, a settled text, and a settled version, is very different from that of the Church in its best and purest ages; and great reason we may have to be grateful to God for it. The Church of the first three centuries

had not a perfectly recognised canon. The New Testament was not made into one book. One person had a roll of one part, another of another. Disputes on the part of the heretics as to the authenticity and text of Scripture were such that, on Tertullian's showing, they precluded an argument from Scripture between Church-people and heretics, since they were not agreed as to what was truly Scripture. This was one of the chief causes which precluded such heretics from appearing, as it were, in court. But even among Catholics there was some degree of uncertainty. There was a margin of unsettled books, not yet fully acknowledged. The Greek would find the Epistle to the Hebrews doubted of when he came to Rome; and the Westerns would hear that they of the East hesitated about the Book of the Revelation. But, so far as we can see, this partial uncertainty among Catholics never seems to have suggested a doubt about the authority of what was acknowledged, or tended in any degree to unsettle their faith.

Variations of texts, again, between the Scriptures, as received in different portions of the Church, were manifest and acknowledged. The same Father seems sometimes to have used one text, sometimes another, according, as it would seem, to the codex he had at hand. Preachers did not hesitate to discuss these differences in their popular discourses, and controversies brought them into special prominence. As to versions, there were extant in Greek no less than seven divers translations of the Old Testament, which were thought by Origen worthy to be brought together, of varying pretensions, and differing considerably from each other; and the Septuagint—that which we might regard as their Authorized Version—was altered and modified, in various degrees, from the more critical versions, and obelized and made critically correct by Origen. Thus there were extant in Greek, and by the labours of Jerome in Latin, copies of the Septuagint, in which all the parts in the Hebrew and not in the Septuagint, or *vice versâ*, were marked,—and these marks, S. Augustine says, were sometimes found attached to almost every word. And this comparison of versions was probably designed by Origen for that use for which S. Augustine afterwards said that he considered the varying versions to be an advantage and assistance to a careful reader in the understanding of Scripture: for one translation aided in eliciting and determining the meaning of another, as, of course, any of us may find. As to the Latin Church, we have the testimony of the same Father¹ to the various versions which were in circulation. We presume that these were versions of portions of the Scripture, not of the whole. He speaks of them as passing number;

¹ De Doctrinâ Christianâ, lib. ii. c. 11, 12.

for, in the earliest times, he says, when any man had got a copy of a book of the New Testament, and knew a little Greek, he translated it. And it was well known and allowed that these versions inadequately represented the original. S. Augustine speaks freely of their mistakes in the treatise '*De Doctrinâ Christianâ*,' and constantly, in sermons and treatises, refers to what is in the original; and before him, Tertullian had not hesitated to refer errors of opinion, among the unlearned of his time, to their simply following the words of the translation. Of course, it may be said that these comparisons of versions were for the more learned, and that the people probably were accustomed only to hear one and the same version read in any particular church, though they knew of these varying texts and varying versions; so that their differing translation, will rather find a parallel in the many new translations which have issued from the press of single books of the Old and New Testament, or the whole of them; few of which, however, have ever reached a second edition, and can now only be found in great libraries.

The great difficulty appears to us to be, not the unsettling the minds of Christian people—unless, indeed, in some sad hour a State Commission should sanction an heretical version—but *the procuring any general acceptance for a new or revised version*. It is not very easy to make such a version even to the satisfaction of the maker himself (unless he be a very vain person); but, supposing it made, how is it to gain general acceptance? What is it which stamps our present version with so much authority? Not its being *the authorized*, but *the universally-received* version. It is easy to 'authorize' a version—

'A breath can make it, as a breath has made.'

But will the Christian world accept it? It may come forth in all the dignity of a 'Blue-book;' but will anything, except general acceptance, secure it from remaining alone in its dignity: and, like so many private attempts, passing out of the remembrance of men? The present version was appointed by authority, but that most questionable, to be read in Churches; and it gradually and steadily made its way among the people. But would any authority now attempt to enjoin the reading a new or corrected version in our Churches, unless it met with very general approval? When the Authorized Version of 1611 came out, there was no generally-received version; and it did itself depart very little from the Bishops' Bible—the version previously appointed to be read in Churches. There was not then any version in possession. There was nothing to displace. At this day there is a version which has the wonderful prerogative of being *the accepted* version of the whole English-speaking world.

Suppose the Church could be brought to accept the revised version, what would those who differ from us do? What would our independent brothers in the United States do? Is it not possible that the breaking up of the old associations attached to our present version would give occasion to each class of religionists to have Bibles of their own? It is true that if such a result were to arise from our doing a plain duty, it would doubtless be overruled to good. But we must see that the course we take is our duty, and that the revision ought to be made, in the one way which we encourage.

The history of former ages of the Church shows the difficulty of introducing a new translation when the people have become accustomed to the old one. Augustine's well-known letter to Jerome, Epist. lxxi. (tom. ii. col. 160), relates a commotion in a church in Africa (which may remind us that even then there were irreverent disturbances in churches), in consequence of this circumstance:—The bishop was reading the Book of Jonah, out of Jerome's new version, made direct from the Hebrew. He read on till he came to something which was quite different from what the people had been accustomed to. The gourd was called 'hedera;' the people had been accustomed to 'cucurbita.' The excitement of the congregation and the populace was great. The Greeks, knowing the Septuagint, asserted that the translation was wrong; the bishop alleged it was so in the Hebrew, and they were obliged to consult some Jews to know what the Hebrew was. The Jews, whether from ignorance or malice, said that the Greek and old Latin were right; and the bishop was obliged to give up the improved version, or his people would have forsaken him. However, Jerome disregarded the entreaties of Augustine, who wished only to have the Latin version of the Septuagint (which he regarded as canonical) revised. The new version was made; having no authority to enforce its use, resting only on its own merits, infinitely superior as it was to the versions then received, it made way slowly; for several centuries the old versions kept their place; they were still transcribed, still cited; and when Jerome's version was ultimately adopted as a whole, the old version of the Psalms, as among ourselves, continued to be used. It was too deeply-rooted in the hearts of the people to be relinquished. And yet their old version had no such authority as ours has; and it was, we need not say, much inferior to it. It must be admitted, on the other hand, there is more intelligence, perhaps, among our people, and more readiness to accept improvements, than among the Latins in the ages following the irruptions of the barbarians; still, we see the difficulty of displacing a received version. It was the work of centuries.

It is then, we think, clear that, to obtain any such general

acceptance as the present version enjoys, the changes made must be sparing; though, perhaps, not so slight as recommended by Professor Selwyn.

This difficulty may have been in part the cause why several persons, who see the necessity for corrections of the Authorized Version, would have those corrections made, not in the text, but in the margin. Thus Professor Scholefield, in the Preface to his first edition of his 'Hints for an Improved Edition of the New Testament' (in the year 1832), in reference to the objection, that to call the public attention to the consideration of any supposed improvement in the Authorized Version of our Bibles, is needlessly to unsettle men's minds, says:—

'I do not underrate this objection; but my answer to it is, that in proportion to the importance of having the sacred text settled, is the importance also of having it settled on a true and safe foundation.'

And again, in regard to the obscurities of Holy Scripture, allowing that those obscurities which arise from the mysterious nature of the revelation are 'a fit exercise for patience and humility and childlike prayer,' yet he says:—

'If it possess any adventitious difficulty, resulting from a defective translation, then it is at the same time an act of charity and of duty to clear away that difficulty as much as possible, and present it to the English reader with the greatest attainable advantage.'

But in the Preface to the second edition (in 1836), he says:—

'The title of this publication has, not unnaturally, led to the inquiry, whether I was really desirous that a new translation of the Greek Testament should be undertaken: to which my reply has uniformly been in the negative. The real design of it was rather to assist toward the understanding of the old translation, than to supersede it by a new one; to furnish a kind of running commentary, for clearing up difficulties as they arose, by presenting the different passages in an English form more accurately corresponding to the original.'

His plan was to carry out and to extend the method of inserting more exact or fairly probable renderings in the margin. The same view is expressed by Dr. W. Wilson, of Winchester, in the Preface to his 'Bible Student's Guide,' where, after speaking of the 'disadvantage in our version of a more uniform rendering of the original not having been adopted by the translators; different renderings of the same word having been in many cases resorted to, as it would seem, rather for the sake of variety than for the purpose of conveying any precise meaning in distinction,' he says:—

'The author has no intention of invalidating a version so long consecrated by the reverent study of many generations, since it was first given to the Church with a providential blessing; nor would we propose to substitute any other version for one so long used: but an edition in which

a more uniform translation of certain words, and a more literal version of certain expressions and phrases, might be appended to the text, would be a boon to most readers.'

And this has been attempted by the Religious Tract Society in their 'Annotated Paragraph Bible;' and something of the kind has been suggested by anonymous writers in the public papers, and particularly, but with an ulterior view, by Professor Selwyn, whose plan is:—

'To print all the corrections which may be approved, separately, at the end of English Bibles; or to admit them into the margin; from whence, after due time allowed for the consideration of the learned, and for gradually familiarizing the public mind to the change, they might finally be received into the text.'—*Selwyn*, p. 10.

This would in fact be carrying out what is done already in the margins of our Bibles; but the existence of which seems to be altogether neglected in the recent discussions. It would be an excellent mode of meeting the difficulty felt by those who are engaged in translating the Scriptures into foreign languages; as the marginal or appended corrections might be included among the 'authorized' renderings; and we think it would be a popular course; for two reasons: (i.) it leaves the English Version just as it was, with all its associations and its historical importance, unimpaired; and (ii.) it supplies materials for understanding that version, for criticising it, for being wiser than it, for reflecting on our advances beyond king James' translation; and particularly it does not authoritatively enforce its translations; but leaves us to be judges, as it were, of the correctness and value of the alterations. It gratifies curiosity, and affords scope for private judgment. These feelings, we fear, lie at the bottom of some objections to the actual embodying in the text of the version, what would generally be admitted to be absolutely certain corrections. As it is, the investigating the correct rendering, and stating and establishing it, is an interesting occupation, and affords materials for a good part of a sermon, or a conversational explanation. A correct Authorized Version would do away with this.

The plan of inserting in the margin is more correct, and literal; or again, rendering what are probable alternatives to that in the text, is one that we approve most highly; we consider that it would, with brief explanatory notes, be exceedingly valuable for the readers of Holy Scripture, even with the most perfect version; nay, necessary to present truly to the reader the modified or possible meaning of the original. Still it has these defects, if the text remain unaltered: (i.) it leaves the erroneous translation to be read in church, and ordinarily in private; it gives it all the weight and influence and impressiveness of being heard and read continually; and (ii.) it confines

the correct rendering to the 'notes and comments,' which would increase greatly the expense of our Bibles, and would possibly create very strong objections on the part of different sects. Still, when we are fit to make any change, this seems to be the safest, the least objectionable; and, if regarded as a temporary measure, the most likely to lead to the ultimate general adoption of a corrected version.

The last question is, By whom are these improvements to be made, whenever they are made?

A proposition has been submitted to Convocation, which is to be considered at their next meeting, for an address to the Crown to appoint a Commission, in these terms:—

'To propose a petition to the Upper House, requesting His Grace and their Lordships to take into consideration the subject of an Address to the Crown, praying that Her Most Gracious Majesty may be pleased to appoint a body of learned men, well skilled in the original languages of the Holy Scriptures;

'To consider of such amendments of the Authorized Version as have been already proposed, and to receive suggestions from all persons who may be willing to offer them;

'To communicate with Foreign Scholars on difficult passages when it may be deemed advisable;

'To examine the Marginal Readings which appear to have been introduced into some editions since the year 1611;

'To point out such words and phrases as have either changed their meaning, or become obsolete in the lapse of time;

'And to report, from time to time, the progress of their work, and the amendments which they may be prepared to recommend.'

This is in substance the same as Mr. Heywood's motion in the House of Commons. We deprecate its adoption. (1.) Because we do not think the time has come for any such general and extensive revision of our version and our text as such a Commission would be likely to make. More progress must be made in Biblical learning, and more attempts by individuals or associated bodies, to be judged of freely by the Christian world, before we can undertake so great a work. (2.) We do not trust such a Commission; nor do we imagine it would have the confidence of the Christian world generally. There is so evident a leaning towards a lax school of theology in the Government appointments, as, for instance, in the Educational department, and in University offices, that we should have much fear as to the character of such a Commission. (3.) It would not be regarded as a Church Commission, as that of James the First was; and the Church ought not to give up her duties as 'the Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ.'

Let this proposition be met by the amendment, that a committee of Convocation be appointed to consider what alterations

may seem to be needed in the Authorized Version. Such a committee might easily carry out Professor Selwyn's view, by confining itself, in the first place at least, to the most necessary corrections—to the hundred or the five hundred which he speaks of. It might be appointed with instructions to that effect. These might be sent out; and without being admitted into the text of our Bibles till they were generally approved, might be made generally known by being printed in a cheap form, so as to bind up with Bibles of various sizes. Such a committee would be conservative; and the clergy are best acquainted with the language suited to the people.

But besides this, let scholars individually, or in associations, labour to perfect the translation of the Bible into English. Let them do what individual scholars have been doing hitherto. Small bodies of men associated together, or consulting the wise, would more easily arrive at some agreement as to the extent of change desirable than larger bodies. Let the translations be submitted to the free criticism of Christian scholars. It will soon be found what their merits and defects are, considered as a version for the people.

Independently of such translations, or by making use of them, the Committee of Convocation might, as we have suggested, prepare what they regarded as necessary emendations of the Authorized Version. Such emendations must be few; and they must not touch the general style and structure of the version. They must preserve its rhythm and cadence—if, which is presumed, they are intended to be generally received. It might be well for communications to be made with other branches of our own Church—that great and widespread confederation in Scotland, America, and the Colonies, on whose close union, and free interchange of sympathy and mutual good understanding, the preservation of the faith and the Church seem to depend; or even with other bodies of Christians,—so as, if possible, to gain their adhesion to the revised version and to secure its general acceptance. But we conceive it would not be desirable to enforce, or even allow, the reading of the revised version in our Churches, unless there were a general willingness on the part of the people to receive it. A schism brought on by the compulsory introduction of an altered version of the Bible, would be the worst schism the Church of England has yet seen.

There seems, however, no reason why—coincidentally with the publication of such a slight revision of our version as would not hinder its early general reception—there should not be a version made as perfect as possible, consistently with our idiom, which might indeed retain the simple dignified English of our present translation, but might attempt, at least, to express the full force

of the original, by those finer shades of sense which must be sacrificed to simplicity and ease, in the version which is to be in the hands of all. How far a general acceptance of such a version might be the result of time we cannot say; but as there would be no contrariety between the two—the one only bringing out more distinctly the force of the original than the other—their co-existence and common reception would be possible. That there should be two Bibles in this sense, would not be very different from the state of things when the version of Jerome was passing into recognition, as in the days of Gregory the Great, who says, in the Epistle to Leander prefixed to his *Moralia*:—‘Cum probationis causa exigit, nunc novam nunc veterem per testimonia assumo, ut quia sedes apostolica, cui Deo auctore præsideo, utraque utitur, mei quoque labor studii ex utraque fulciatur.’ It must, however, always be remembered that S. Gregory’s flock was not divided into innumerable sects, who, in the midst of the changes, would very possibly set up each a Bible of their own. Indeed, the divisions of English Christendom are the cause that makes the difficulties of the subject seem almost infinite.

But if a revision is to be made, it is the business of the Church in England to make that revision—for it is her Bible in a sense in which it is that of no other body. It is hers by its parentage. It is hers by the obligation she has to use it. But in another sense the revising it is her work; for she alone can do it. We say deliberately that, in respect of the New Testament, the Church of England alone, of all the Christian bodies speaking our tongue, possesses scholarship sufficient for the work. And such we apprehend is the respect felt towards her, such the appreciation of her fairness and moderation, that a revision made by her would be more likely to meet with general acceptance, both in England and our Colonies, and the United States, than one made by any other body or association, or a commission appointed by the Queen of England. Here happily the Church is a bond of union, where the Queen’s ‘Supremacy’ would only be a stumbling-block. Above all, it is never to be forgotten that the Church of England stands in a very different position from other religious bodies in reference to the Authorized Version of Holy Scripture. She is, we must presume, bound to adhere to it, whilst other bodies may adopt new ones as they will. So if by any force a revision of the Authorized Version were brought about, even against the will of the Church, it might turn out to be quite compatible with the *liberal* principles of the day to enforce the use of it on the Church by Act of Parliament. Let it be remembered, then, that a claim on the part of the State of altering the Bible, is usurping the highest office of the Church.

It is, indeed, 'tuning' her teaching. It is practically twisting Divine Revelation: and as to the existence of a permanent State Commission, to see to the perpetual correcting of our Bible, recommended by Mr. Harness, it would be a form of tyranny over the Church, which even the Popes in their highest claims ventured not to adopt; and any step towards the recognition of such a power in the State should be vigorously resisted. The care of Holy Scripture, and of its being presented purely and truly to the people, is the proper work of the Church; and so is it her part to look to it, and herself to do what is right and reasonable should be done. It may be that the people will still keep their old version unchanged. It is certain any such alterations will be exposed to the criticisms of ignorance and prejudice,—for the many read and criticise, the very few are able to judge. Still, good may come of it, or worse evils be avoided.

We will conclude this article with some excellent observations which we have seen since it was written; they are from the Introduction to Mr. Ellicott's 'Notes on the Pastoral Epistles of S. Paul.'

'With regard to this very important subject, the revision of our Authorized Version, I would fain here make a few observations, as I am particularly anxious that my humble efforts in this direction should not be misinterpreted or misunderstood.

'What is the present state of feeling with regard to a revision of our present Version? It seems clear that there are now *three* parties among us. The first, those who, either from what seem seriously mistaken views of a translation of the Holy Scripture, or from sectarian prejudice, are agitating for a *new* translation. The second, those who are desirous for a revision of the existing Version, but who somewhat differ in respect to the proposed alterations and the principles on which they are to be introduced. The third, those who, from fear of unsettling the religious belief of weaker brethren, are opposed to alterations of *any* kind; positive and demonstrable error in the representation of the words of inspiration being, in their judgment, less pernicious than change. Of these three parties, the first is far the smallest in point of numbers, but the most persistent in activities; the second class is daily increasing, yet at the present greatly inferior, both in number and influence, to the third.

'Which of these three parties will prevail? We may fervently trust not the first. Independently of the extreme danger of unsettling the cherished convictions of thousands, of changing language that has spoken to doubting or suffering hearts with accents that have been to them like the voice of God Himself,—independently of reversing a traditional principle of revision that has gained strength and reception since the days of Tyndale,—independently of sowing a strife in the Church, of which our children and children's children may reap the bitter fruits,—independently of all these momentous considerations, have we any good reason for thinking that, in a mere literary point of view, it would be likely to be an improvement on the old translation? The almost pitiable attempts under the name of New Translations that have appeared in the last twenty years, the somewhat low state of biblical scholarship, the diminishing vigour of

the popular language of our day, are facts well calculated to sober our expectations and qualify our self-confidence.

‘But are we unreservedly to join the third party? God forbid. If we are truly and heartily persuaded that there are errors and inaccuracies in our Version, if we know that, though by far the best and most faithful translation that the world has ever seen, it still shares the imperfections that belong to every human work, however noble and exalted,—if we feel and know that these imperfections are no less patent than remediable, then surely it is our duty to Him who gave that blessed Word for the guidance of man, through evil report and through good report, to labour by gentle counsels to supply what is lacking, and correct what is amiss, to render what has been blessed with great measures of perfection yet more perfect, and to hand it down thus marked with our reverential love and solicitude as the best and most blessed heritage we have to leave to them who shall follow us.

‘It is in vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there *are* misconceptions, there *are* obscurities—not indeed so many in number or so grave in character as the forward spirits of our day would persuade us of,—but there *are* misrepresentations of the language of the Holy Ghost; and that man, who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will, if they be true, most surely at the dread day of final account, have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable Word of God.

‘But are we to take no thought of the weaker brethren whose feelings may be lacerated, or whose conscience may be offended by seeming innovations? That be far from us. We must win them by gentle wisdom, we must work conviction in their minds by showing how little, comparatively speaking, there is that is absolutely wrong—how persuasively it may be amended—how we may often recur to the expressions of our older versions, and from those rich stores of language, those treasuries of pure and powerful English, may find the very rectification we would fain adopt, the very translation we are seeking to embody in words. No revision of our Authorized Version can hope to meet with approval or recognition that ignores the labours of those wise and venerable men who first enabled our forefathers to read in their own tongue of the marvellous works and the manifold wisdom of God.

‘Let there be, then, no false fears about a loving and filial revision of our present version. If done in the spirit, and with the circumspection that marked the revision of that predecessor to which it owes its own origin and existence, no conscience, however tender, either will be or ought to be wounded. Nay, there seems intimation in their very preface, that our last translators expected that others would do to them as they had done to those who had gone before them; and if they could now rise from their graves and aid us by their counsels, which side would they take? Would they stay our hands if they saw us seeking to perfect their work? Would they not rather join with us, even if it led sometimes to the removal or dereliction of the monuments of their own labour, in laying out yet more straightly the way of Divine truth?

‘How this great work is to be accomplished in detail is not for such a one as me to attempt to define. This only I will say, that it is my honest conviction that for any *authoritative* revision we are not yet mature, either in Biblical learning or Hellenistic scholarship. There is good scholarship in this country, superior, probably, to that of any nation in the world, but it

has certainly not yet been sufficiently directed to the study of the New Testament (for of the New Testament only am I now speaking) to render any national attempt at a revision either hopeful or lastingly profitable. Our best and wisest course seems to be this: to encourage small bands of scholars to make independent efforts on separate books; to invite them manfully to face and court impartial criticism, and so by their very failures to learn practical wisdom, and out of their censors to secure coadjutors, and, by their partial successes, to win over the prejudiced and the gain-saying. If a few such attempts were to be made, and they were to meet with encouragement and sympathy, such a stimulus would be given to biblical studies, that a very few years would elapse before England might be provided with a company of wise and cunning craftsmen, into whose hands she might hopefully confide her jewel of most precious price.

Under any circumstances, we may devoutly hope that no party feeling will be allowed for one moment to outrage the sobriety of thought with which this subject ought to be approached. It is humiliating enough to reflect that there are among us religious parties and animosities; but it would be doubly humiliating to think that a great work,—a work on which the hopes and salvation of thousands, aye, and tens of thousands, depend,—was either perversely obstructed or wilfully precipitated by the strife and turmoil of religious discord. If higher arguments do not prevail, let us remember that two good and learned men, who in their lifetimes were respectively claimed by very opposite parties, and who might not have had very many points in common—the late Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, and the late Greek Professor of the University of Cambridge; the one, as transpires through his "Lectures on the Duties of a Parish Priest," the other, in his "Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament,"—appear to have held on the subject of the revision of our Version opinions that are very nearly identical.

Among the recent specimens of Revision we scarcely noticed that of the American Bible Union, whose translation of the Second Epistle of S. Peter, those of S. John, that of S. Jude, and of the Book of Revelation, has been published. We observe in it a disposition, on the whole, to adhere pretty closely to the language of the Authorized Version, but the scholarship displayed is miserable. Much pains has been taken to compare translations and annotations, with occasional success; but our readers will appreciate our neglect of the work when we say that in the text of four verses of the first chapter there are the following words, *ζῶν, κοινωνίαν* twice, *Ἰησοῦ, πεπληρωμένη, ἀκεκόσμεν*, and *φῶς*, and *αὐτῷ*, &c. There is a table of *errata* at the beginning, but these blunders are not noticed; only there is this general apology about accents: 'In several instances the Greek accents and Hebrew points have been broken off in the press;' but were those in *φῶς* and *αὐτῷ* broken *on*? *ἐγνώκα* and *ἐγνώκαμεν* are translated 'we have known;' chap. iii. 4 is translated, 'Every one that committeth sins committeth also violation of law; and sin is violation of law;' 'Every one that hateth his brother is a *man-killer*.' There is, however, one excellent feature in the version,—it does not often alter the Authorized Version.

ART. VI.—1. *A Tabular View of Articles XXV., XXVIII., XXIX., with Considerations upon 'the True and Legal Exposition of Arts. XXVIII. XXIX.,' as set forth at the Court at Bath in the Trial of the Ven. the Archdeacon of Taunton.* By the Rev. C. S. GRUEBER, B.A. &c. London: Masters. 1856.

2. *The Defence of the Archdeacon of Taunton.* July, 1856. London: Masters. 1856.

If indignation, according to the poet, makes verse, in the case of the wise it suppresses prose. We have hitherto been but chary in our allusions to the Denison case, partly because we did not choose to say what would seem to be ungenerous, and yet what it would have been our duty, to express, our lack of sympathy with the discretion which in the first instance brought, or forced, into discussion in such a way such a doctrine. As the proceedings went on, we still hoped that the silence, or at least the visible restraint, under which many, like ourselves, kept their feelings, so long and so severely outraged, might in the end prevail, if not with Mr. Ditcher and those whose tool and instrument he is, at least with others higher in station and authority. We felt that the Archbishop and his advisers, and even his legal friends, must be aware of the feelings of Churchmen on the matter in question. They must have known, so we argued with ourselves, how deep was the stake at issue to such as ourselves and those whose opinions we represent. All these considerations of feelings outraged, of confidence shaken, of hopes and future usefulness possibly shattered, we thought it superfluous to urge. We gave credit to our opponents for at least feeling towards ourselves like Christians, if not as brethren; and we thought that our silence might at least be appreciated. It is an undeniable fact that many have of late declined openly to avow their estimate of the interests involved in the Denison case, neither from apathy towards the true doctrine of the Sacraments as held by the Church of England, nor from a lack of sympathy with the Archdeacon of Taunton, but solely to see if a conciliating attitude, and that 'keeping silence, yea, even from good words, though it was a pain and grief to us,' might not win upon adversaries whom, after all, we could not but look upon as fathers and brethren. In this hope we have been disappointed. That very reluctance to embitter dispute has but been the warrant for treating us with the greater injustice. The less we have provoked, the more certainly we have received an unfair trial. Nothing, as it seems, would satisfy the rancour

of party, but to crush a theological opponent even at the expense of the candour and the calmness of the judicial station. Archdeacon Denison has not had a fair trial; and at the present stage of the proceedings we confine ourselves to establish this fact, and this with such conciseness as considerations for our own temper and gravity require.

We omit all reference to the preliminary commission at Clevedon. A page so discreditable to our ecclesiastical annals, and in itself so utterly unimportant, may as well be blotted out from men's minds. The form of proceeding has in this instance received its mercy-stroke. The existing Church Discipline Act wanted but such an exhaustive instance as this to prove to demonstration its intrinsic worthlessness. Under all circumstances, the selection of a panel of preliminary inquirers entails a dangerous discretion on the ecclesiastical judge. Suffice it to say, that the judge in this instance was not above party influences. The Commissioners were not, like a Committee of the House of Commons, selected on the principle of representing both sides of the proposed inquiry. Clergymen all diametrically, and one notoriously, opposed to the Archdeacon, were selected. They reported, and we shall not condescend to characterize or to commemorate their report. It is enough to say that the Commissioners declined to hear the Archdeacon and his counsel in defence, thereby reversing the precedent set in the Monckton case.

On August 12, the trial of the Archdeacon of Taunton, before his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, was concluded. Whether it was 'by luck or management,' as the saying is—but the court did consist of men whose views were notorious. The Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford was the only theological authority in official station who could be depended upon. He was selected in preference to the Regius Professor. The Dean of Wells was equally safe. Dr. Lushington had just signalized himself in a notorious instance as ready to propose his private sentiments as law even at the expense of the sanctity of the judicial character. So much for the constitution of the court.

In the exercise of its functions we have to notice, and it is a deplorable proof, that the unhappy rule in ecclesiastical matters laid down by Lord Denman in the Hampden case, that strict law is to give way to supposed considerations of public convenience,—that is to say, that justice in Church matters is to be accommodated to popular prejudices,—was followed to the letter. We remark in the conduct of the case,

1. The summary and unjudicial rejection of the legal objections offered by Dr. Phillimore. These objections embraced, among others, the very grave ones, (a) that the commissioners

were unfairly selected; (β) that the period of two years specified for the trial of ecclesiastical offences under the Church Discipline Act had expired; (γ) and that the criminal articles falsely recited that the report of the Clevedon Commissioners had been duly filed, which, in fact, it had not.

2. The circumstances that the judge pointed out and prescribed a certain line and course of defence to the Archdeacon's counsel, and in the course of the trial refused to allow him the benefit of the course so enjoined. In the commencement of Dr. Phillimore's defence Dr. Lushington inquired if Dr. Phillimore was about to call witnesses: if so, Dr. Bayford would be entitled to a full reply on the whole defence: if not, Dr. Bayford's reply must be confined to an examination of Dr. Phillimore's authorities. Dr. Phillimore declined to call witnesses: and yet, in reply, Dr. Bayford was permitted not only to refute, or to attempt to refute, the Archdeacon's authorities, but to re-open the whole case and re-argue his original argument.

3. The denial of an appeal to Scripture. The charge against the Archdeacon was that he had taught doctrine contrary to the Articles: in other words, the dispute was as to the interpretation of the Articles. Either, then, the sense of the Articles is self-manifest, or they must be construed under some principle of interpretation. It might be thought that if, as the Articles themselves teach, the Creeds are to be received on the ground of their agreement with Scripture, the Articles themselves would not refuse a tribunal so august. That the Articles are neither so precise nor so intelligible, is clear from the fact that, taken, as Mr. Gorham would have said, in its naked verballity, one of them pronounces Confirmation to have grown from a corrupt following of the Apostles. The Articles must be construed in harmony with some external authority. It is not to be Scripture.

4. It is not to be antiquity: for Dr. Lushington, although Article XXIX. formally grounds itself on S. Augustine's authority, expressly restricted Dr. Phillimore's Augustinian citations 'to explain a word.'

5. It is not to be the Prayer-book: for Dr. Lushington directly forbids an appeal to it. He makes the Articles the whole and entire standard of doctrine. Laud had said, 'The Jesuit offers to enclose me too much. I did not say that the Book of Articles only was the continent of the Church of England's public doctrine. She is not so narrow, nor hath she purpose to exclude anything which she acknowledges hers,' (Against Fisher, Sect. XIV. i.) and with true charity and wisdom, as though contemplating such a case as the present, the great Archbishop proceeds, 'It is one thing to hold contrary to some part of an Article, which perhaps may be but in the

'manner of expression; and another thing positively to affirm 'that the Articles in any part of them are superstitious and 'erroneous.' (Ibid.) The present Archbishop through his assessors denies this latitude; he is 'so narrow,' he pronounces his Articles to be 'the continent of the Church's public doctrine.' Careless of the revisions of 1604 and 1662, nay careless of the Prayer-book, he pronounces for the first time that the XXXIX. Articles self-interpreted are the solitary standard of the Church of England. Dr. Lushington has excluded consideration of the weighty facts that since the 13 Eliz. the Catechism has been enlarged by the definition of a Sacrament, that the Liturgy has been changed, and that the Canons of 1603 pointedly refer to the Liturgy as containing and exhibiting, and therefore as teaching, the doctrine of the Eucharist; while in a very important matter since Elizabeth's time the Church has deliberately abandoned an Elizabethan mode of speech about this very sacrament in the Declaration suffixed to the Communion Service.

6. It is not to the reformers and divines of the Church. For they at any rate prove in the *Catenæ* published by Mr. Chambers, so fully and ably illustrated by Mr. Grueber, and brought forward by Dr. Phillimore, that a doctrine substantially equivalent to Archdeacon Denison's has constantly been held and taught in the Church of England; therefore that his doctrine is permissible. Further, we do not press a claim. That in all respects it is literally exact, still less that it is exclusive, we do not urge. That it is not irreconcilable with the formularies of the Church, the mere fact that it, or something equivalent to it, has been so reconciled, is sufficient for the fact that the Church is patient of it. If patient of it, it cannot be in the judgment of men quite as able and learned as Drs. Sumner and Lushington, such men as Andrewes, Bramhall, Grabe, Ken, Lake, Mede, Poynt, Ridley, Saravia, and above all Thorndike, 'directly contrary and repugnant to the XXVIIIth and XXIXth Articles.'

7. But, above all, we charge the Bath judgment with gross unfairness and injustice, because for a party purpose it reverses that freedom of interpretation which, in the Gorham case, this very Dr. Lushington was a party, and an influential party, in laying down. Then, as the Court took care to enforce, the standards of interpretation were the Articles and Liturgy. Then, the greatest and most scrupulous deference was paid to the crude speculations of all the ignoble herd of puritanical writers whom Mr. William Goode's perverse industry could rake up. It was enough to save Mr. Gorham that some forgotten scribbler of Elizabeth's time had said, and had said unpunished, some contradiction of common-sense morality like

Mr. Gorham's unnatural interpretations. This principle of latitude, which, whatever its dangers, had been laid down, is now abandoned. It was adopted for one party purpose, it is given up for another. The Lesbian rule, which had been unduly stretched in one direction, has suddenly collapsed in another, under the very hands which do not refuse to play fast and loose for the same sectarian and prejudiced objects. Whether rightly or wrongly the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has decided that the mere fact of holding and publicly avowing certain opinions unchallenged on the part of acknowledged divines, is an evidence and guarantee that the Church of England does permit in these days to its clergy an equal liberty. This is the principle of the Gorham judgment; that is, it is Dr. Lushington's principle in 1851. In 1856 this same Dr. Lushington lays down as law that it is no matter who has held the doctrine complained of; that it is not to be inquired into if the doctrine is or is not fortified by Scripture; is, or is not, in harmony with the Prayer-book;—if, in his, Dr. Lushington's, solitary opinion, it seems to be repugnant to his, Dr. Lushington's, solitary and unsupported interpretation of a single Article, the person who holds it is to be deprived.

Although we had purposed merely to confine ourselves to the legal wrong and judicial unfairness of the Bath judgment, we cannot but allude in a single paragraph to its monstrous folly. Professing to be guided by the most scrupulous reverence for the letter of a formulary, Dr. Lushington puts forth statements which if they are to be construed literally are absolute nonsense. He says that the doctrine—

‘It is not true that the consecrated bread and wine are changed in their natural substance, for they remain in their natural substances, and are not to be worshipped: it is true that worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural Presence of the Body and Blood of CHRIST in the Holy Eucharist, under the form of bread and wine’—

is directly contrary and repugnant to the XXVIIIth and XXIXth Articles, &c.

That is to say, Dr. Lushington denies *both* statements of the Archdeacon: not only does he deny the Archdeacon's last and affirmative statement, but he pronounces his first and negative statement to be equally repugnant and contrary to the Articles. What the Archdeacon denies the Judge must, if his words have meaning, assert. Archdeacon Denison says, ‘it is not true,’ Dr. Lushington therefore says it is true, ‘that the consecrated bread and wine are changed in their natural substances.’ In short, considered according to the ordinary rules of construction, so loosely and slovenly is it worded, Dr. Lushington's judgment decidedly affirms the doctrine of Transubstantiation in its grossest form.

Further, as regards the positive statement, Archdeacon Denison asserts, that 'worship is due to the real though invisible and supernatural Presence,' &c. This Dr. Lushington asserts to be directly contrary and repugnant to the Article. The Article says nothing whatever of worship to the Presence, real, supernatural, or even corporeal; it simply asserts a fact, that 'by Christ's ordinance the Sacrament was not worshipped.' The Archdeacon never said anything about Christ's ordinance; he only asserted that worship was due, not to the Sacrament, but to the Presence. The Article denies a certain fact, viz. that the Sacrament was ordered by our Lord to be worshipped. Consistent, theoretically with this might stand the fact, that the Sacrament was in fact by the Church worshipped, or that even worship might be due to the Sacrament. We do not say that these things are so. We only say that the Article says nothing about them; still less does it say anything about the consideration whether worship is due to the Presence. The Archdeacon is condemned for making an assertion of which the subject is 'the Presence:' this assertion, he is told, is 'directly contrary to the Article;' whereas the Article never uses the word *Presence* at all—never says anything about it, one way or other. The Archdeacon is condemned for an assertion, true or false, about a certain theological term, the subject of his proposition, which term is never even alluded to in the Article. We cannot agree with those who say that the Bath Court has not condemned the doctrine of the Real Objective Presence. We say that the Court has condemned it, and has gone out of its way to condemn it, and has condemned it by the words of a document which does not even in terms allude to it at all.

And now, on the very day in which these remarks are published, the Court will proceed, we suppose, to fulminate its final decree—we had nearly said, to fill up the measure of its iniquity—a phrase which we will change for the measure of its folly; for very recently, as it seems, the whole aspect of the case has become changed. It seems to be pretty clearly established by the most seemingly conclusive evidence that the whole case will tumble down, carrying in its fall Dr. Lushington's legal character. In order to make the punishment as penal as possible, proceedings were taken under Eliz. 13, simply because this statute, and this statute alone, entails deprivation on a contradiction of the Articles. Mr. Ditcher and his friends might have prosecuted the Archdeacon under the general law of the Church, as having contradicted the Church's general teaching, the Articles included. This, because the less obnoxious and less penal course, was declined. They selected the old and vindictive statute because of its penalties. Investigation has since produced the notable fact,

that at the time of the passing of Eliz. 13, this very XXIXth Article had actually no existence. The penal statute Eliz. 13, alludes to a book lately imprinted. This book lately imprinted does not contain Article XXIX. It was well known to inquirers that Article XXIX. was contrary to Queen Elizabeth's taste, and her political views of comprehension, and was especially distasteful to a strong party of the time—to Bishop Guest among others—and that its final insertion in the Articles was the result of a severe conflict. Dr. Lamb's celebrated and very scarce *fac-simile* reprint of the successive editions of the Articles contains the book lately imprinted, which does not contain the Article. If this be so—and we cannot see how the force of the fact can be evaded—the Archdeacon's prosecution *under* Eliz. 13 falls to the ground.

'Solvuntur risu tabulæ: tu missus abibis.'

Of course Mr. Ditcher can begin again; but it remains to inquire whether, under any circumstances, any Clergyman can be convicted under Eliz. 13 by a Court conducted as that of Bath is. Is it not a fact that the Courts at Westminster will hold that the interpretation of an Act of Parliament is *ultra vires* of such a tribunal, and, therefore, establishes a *prima facie* ground for prohibition from the Queen's Bench?

NOTICES.

'THE Defence of the Archdeacon of Taunton,' (Masters,) consists of Dr. Phillimore's able argument *in extenso*, together with such subsidiary materials, *catena*, and the like, as were either rejected or laid aside during the progress of the trial. We have here not only a proof that the Archdeacon's doctrines were admissible, but strong approximating evidence that they may be 'the doctrine' of the Church of England. As a matter of surplusage, the second branch of defence was not entered upon. The volume is very complete, and embodies much of Mr. Grueber's learned and satisfactory investigations on the subject. Merely as an authoritative collection, we should have preferred Dr. Bayford's argument in a more authentic form: and the judgment of Dr. Lushington ought to have been appended.

This is not Mr. Grueber's only contribution to this important matter. In his 'Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury,' and in his 'Tabular View of Articles XXV., XXVIII., XXIX.,' &c. (Masters,) he exhausts the subject; and, with much learning and argumentative power, has produced works which, far beyond their immediate and painful objects, rank their author as a theologian of great promise and large actual accomplishments.

In the Bishop of Ripon's recent 'Charge,' (Leeds: Harrison,) we notice and extract from it the fact, that out of 420 livings in that diocese, there are 243 of which the income does not exceed 150*l.* per annum; and we present it to the writer of the recent 'Church Articles' in the 'Times.'

'The Incomes of the Clergy, what they ought to be, and how to make them so,' (Seeley,) is a pamphlet by Mr. F. W. Harper, suggesting that the existing clergy should, by way of beginning, cut down their incomes by paying a Church Augmentation Fund of one-tenth of their incomes; and that all clergymen hereafter presented to livings, should tax them in whatever they exceed 500*l.* a-year. In other words, he proposes, in the end, to equalize all livings at 500*l.* per annum. And when this act of ecclesiastical communism is completed, he will suggest, we should think, to apply this principle to all property.

From Mr. Arthur Baker, now usefully at work in New Zealand, we receive a lecture on 'the Denominational (so called) System of National Education as best adapted to Colonial needs.' (Wellington, &c.) It is written not only with the results of experience, but with considerable force and spirit.

Appended to Mr. Gurney's 'Sermon at the Consecration of the Bishop of Gloucester,' (Rivingtons,) we find this gentleman's usual complaint of

the bad preaching in the Church of England. We admit the fact, but not in the way of contrast: we deny, judging from their published specimens, judging from Mr. Spurgeon's success, judging from the 'Pulpit,' which, at any rate, contains what answers Mr. Gurney's test, that of acceptability, that the Dissenters' sermons, merely as sermons, are better than our own. We admit that the University Professors of Pastoral Theology might usefully combine a practical course on homiletics with their ordinary theoretical disquisitions. But is not the real remedy to be found in the Theological Colleges? In these alone is the sphere where young men can be taught the clerical attitude. It is no less than a fact that we have, in one respect, over-educated the clergy. Their minds are too refined to be effective preachers. What makes us despair of coming to an understanding with the general herd of sermon critics, is our utter incapacity to arrive at what any of our instructors consider the model of a preacher. Mr. Gurney, for example, considers Dr. Guthrie and Mr. Robertson admirable specimens of the pulpit orator. The two men are as opposite in style as Bacon and Ossian. Robertson is plain, practical, severe, and familiar: Guthrie turgid, rhetorical, and diffuse.

'Lays of Memory, Sacred and Social, by a Mother and Son,' (Hurst & Blackett.) This volume does not rise above the average of pretty and religious album verses which any school-girl could write. The poems are well meant, and form a handsomely-printed volume.

Dr. Irons has printed a Sermon, which he preached, in 1850, on the Gorham case, and again, in 1856, on the Denison case, counselling patience and prayer in public ecclesiastical troubles. Its title is 'Christ's Promise to keep His People in Times of Trial.' (Masters.) It is warm and affectionate; and its object is to stay defections Romewards, not upon argumentative, but experimental grounds.

An article from our own pages, 'Mahometanism,' *Christian Remembrancer*, January, 1855, has been reprinted and authenticated by its writer, the Rev. J. G. Cazenove, of Cumbrae. (Mozley.) It has, we are convinced, recommended itself by its fulness and eloquence to our readers; and we are glad that, as a complete monograph of the subject, it has in this form become generally accessible.

Mr. E. B. Denison has a large share of self-consciousness; some would call it self-something-else. However, all that he writes is worth reading, or is, at least, quite readable. His 'Lectures on Church Building' (Bell & Daldy) are the expansion of some hints and advice which he delivered to the people of Doncaster, in connexion with the rebuilding of their parish church. In this work Mr. Denison did good service. We do not think that his Lectures have stuff enough in them to take the form of a regular treatise. The cool characteristic way in which Mr. Denison patronises such a person as Mr. George Scott is at least amusing.

'Sir Robert Peel's Memoirs,' vol. i. (Murray,) do not tell us much with which we were previously unacquainted. They do represent many persons,

George IV. among them, in a more unfavourable and perplexing light; and they elevate our estimate of the dutiful and conscientious character of the autobiographer. To clerical readers, what is preserved of Bishop Lloyd's confidential communications is important. But, after all, the work is a very fragmentary contribution to the materials of future history. There is very much more to tell in some quarters.

Another volume of poems from Mr. Archer Gurney, '*Songs of Early Summer*,' (Longman,) lead us to acknowledge in this very pleasing writer a large flow of poetic diction, and an ear quite alive to melody. We think that perhaps his powers want concentration; and the habit of turning every thought into verse begets a facility fatal to enduring efforts. In the end of the present volume, we find some amusing satiric verses, in the shape of parody, on some of Mr. Gurney's poetical contemporaries.

Mrs. Phillipson, a name new to us, has published a volume of poems, called '*Lonely Hours*,' (Moxon.) We must award to this lady acknowledgment for her undeniable claims to attention on the score of considerable acquirements and powers. She writes touchingly, and with much point, and with great variety of metre. But there is much in the volume which we cannot understand: we do not know, nor, were it not in print, are we concerned to know, whether the writer is speaking in her own or in another's person. If the former, she should have told us less, or more about herself: as the volume stands, there is so much scandal, detraction, false accusations, and so on, alluded to in the way of complaint, that we are perfectly puzzled about the whole thing. Mrs. Phillipson is a victim of some sort, and protests innocence with a vehemence of which we cannot understand the how or why: and in many poems the authoress attacks her friends or acquaintance in a way which we should think was libellous. But as we never heard of one of the parties, mystification is to ourselves the chief result of the volume, not uncoupled with regret at a certain unfeminine tone, which detracts from what would, under other aspects, ripen into respect for this writer.

Mr. E. A. Freeman has, in his '*History and Conquests of the Saracens*,' (J. H. Parker,) chosen a subject very suitable to his brilliant and effective style. The subject, however, is too large for Mr. Freeman's canvas. He will scarcely expect us to sympathise with his estimate of Akbar's pantheism. Toleration is one thing, and the present writer may be right in his eulogies on it; but the fact of Akbar's religion was that he professed, and in the East an emperor's professions are preachings, that all creeds, Buddhism, Judaism, Mahometanism, Christianity, and the old Hindoo Monotheism, are all the same thing, which same thing, whether it was true or false, was quite unimportant.

The position of Dr. Thiersch, a German Irvingite, would of itself make his '*Christian Family Life*,' translated by Mr. Gardiner, (Bosworth,) an extremely interesting volume. It is this, not only because it points out from experience the dangers of a relaxed marriage-law in a Lutheran community, but because it is very explicit on the dangers of Luther's own

views on the relations of the sexes. Besides all this, Dr. Thiersch writes very practically on the domestic relations, especially on education. We desire, however, that his condemnation of public schools should be understood only as what it is—an exception against the German gymnasia. Of schools conducted as we are glad to think our own great schools, almost without exception, are, Dr. Thiersch has no experience. His strictures on female education also must be construed as written under other auspices than our own.

'The Duties of the Parish Priest,' by Professor Blunt, (Murray,) remind us that in real usefulness the writer has perhaps never been excelled in these latter days. The wisdom, that is the calm sense of strength, which these lectures display; the utter absence of what is called party-spirit, and, therefore, the independent witness both to Catholic truth and ritual exactness; the liberality, charity, and largeness of view which they embody; their profusion of illustrative learning, and their close acquaintance with the practical matters of the priest's office, render this the most trustworthy handbook with which we are acquainted. We despair that either University will be blessed with a living Divinity Professor equal to Professor Blunt. We recommend this work as a manual in our Theological Colleges.

'Syria and the Syrians,' by Mr. G. M. Wortarbet, (Madden,) is a worthless book. The writer asks us 'to make allowance for his education and national style of expression.' Not to be able to write English, and to be very ignorant, are strong reasons against publication, not abatements of its folly.

'Bishop Torry's Life and Times,' (Masters,) is a volume for which we are indebted to Mr. Neale. It is written in the picturesque style, and with that ample detail in which the biographer excels; but in our own judgment, looking at the volume in its merely literary aspect, Bishop Torry scarcely fills such a space in Church history as to justify this large biography. Most important, however, in the way of recording an important chapter in our own history, are the details on the life and fortunes of the Scotch Communion Office and the S. Andrew's Prayer-book. Still, history ought to recede somewhat from its subjects: the groups want fusing and harmonizing; and whenever we get annals written too soon, the suspicion, at least, of partiality is unavoidable.

From the same writer we receive 'Mediæval Preachers and Mediæval Preaching,' (Mozley.) The substance of this very curious volume has appeared in this Review; and the article made, as it deserved to make, a considerable sensation. It is now expanded, and enriched with various illustrations; and among others, we commend it to Mr. Gurney; for Mr. Neale, equally possessed with Mr. Gurney's feelings as to the dryness of extant sermons, at least proposes in the way of remedy something which we can grasp and try. Mr. Gurney only finds fault; Mr. Neale offers an alternative.

There are many points of doctrine, and those very serious ones, in which we differ from Mr. Ashton Oxenden; yet his 'Pathway of Safety; or, Counsel to the Awakened,' (Wertheim,) is much, in practical teaching, in advance of the school by which the writer would probably consider himself best represented.

A little volume styled 'Epitaphs, collected and arranged by Mr. Hare, of University College, Oxford,' (J. H. Parker,) contains—it were impossible that it should not contain—much that is interesting; but the subject is beyond the compiler's powers and researches. A collection of extant epitaphs which bring out the permission of commemoration in prayer of the dead in the recent English Church, would have great value; but, judging from the chance medley way in which the present writer heaps together religious observations on stone, embodying the most opposite views of the condition of the Christian dead, it does not seem to occur to him that there is a doctrinal right and wrong as to the state of the departed. Nor are we quite satisfied as to the propriety of presenting in this form the ludicrous and offensive epitaphs of which we all remember too many. Some which Mr. Hare preserves are simply disgusting. Does Mr. Hare intend us to construe conjunctively 'the curious *and* beautiful' in the following among his Latin Epitaphs?—

'Hic jacet vir, perpendiculariter honestus;'

and this execrable trash—

'Musicus et logicus Wynal hic jacet ecce Johannes :
Organa namque loqui fecerat ille quasi.'

Both, we regret to be told, occur in English cathedrals.

'Threescore Years and Ten,' (Masters,) by Archdeacon Wilkins, is a pleasant, indeed affecting, memorial of a good man's sunset time. There is just that amount of gentle garrulity, mellowed by Christian experience and right feeling, which makes the picture at once engaging and accurate.

'Midsummer Holidays,' (Masters,) is a child's story-book of the most childish sort. There is a great deal of gabble, useful enough to talk to children, but not useful enough to print. And Church writers should remember, that in committing nonsense to the press—a serious matter at all times—they commit others beside themselves.

'The English Hymnal: a Hymn-book for the Church of England,' (J. H. Parker,) is inconsistent in its title—an inconsistency which illustrates its contents. It has no right to the exclusive '*The*;' and as regards '*a*,' we are already surfeited with Manuals not one shadow worse than the present. It is entirely uncalled for.

'Stories on the Commandments,' by Mr. Rockstro, (Masters.) Here we reiterate our old complaint. The collection is not wanted; the stories are very well, neither good nor bad; but, as far as we can judge, the only object in multiplying these Hymn-books, Story-books, Catechisms, Lec-

tures, Prayers, Illustrative Stories on Collects, Epistles, and what not, is to distract the attention of purchasers, to cause rivalry and ill-feeling among writers, and to make even commercial success impossible. Soon after the commencement of the Reformation, there was a royal order to stop preaching for a year. What if our Church publishers were to try the value, both to themselves and to the Church, of an abstinence for the next six months from all good little books? Certain we are that we have enough on hand to keep things going.

Mr. Whitehead's *Sermons, 'The Church and the People,'* (Rivingtons,) show—and we commend it with that view to certain cynical persons, who think, or affect to think, that it is impossible for the clergy of London to establish any personal relations with their parishioners—the amount of quiet, yet most real, work which attends the new churches in the metropolis and elsewhere. Mr. Whitehead labours in the 'slums' of the west of London: and we believe that one of the first, and, as all clergy find, most imperative calls on him was to release his church from pew-rents. Till this is done in every church in London, the work of Church extension is a delusion.

'*Scripture and Science not at Variance,*' by Archdeacon Pratt, (Hatchard,) is a large title for a small performance. As far as the writer goes, he has done something; but that far is but a small way.

In '*Agonistes, or Philosophical Strictures,*' by Mr. Lyall, (Rivingtons,) we detect considerable powers. They are desultory, and occasionally crude: and Mr. Lyall must have considerable confidence in his own strength to assume the critical chair towards so many, and those so distinguished, of his contemporaries. Is it a fact, that the English estimate of the sanctity of landed property has given the law to Europe on the subject? We know nothing to establish any exception as regards England in this respect. In his metaphysics we think the present writer is tentative; and in his political speculations he, like the old Sophists, generally seems to regard the subject eristically than on established convictions.

'*Sponsorial Stipulations at Infant Baptism considered,*' &c. (Darling.) This pamphlet professes to be by a clergyman. Certainly we hold the indelibility of orders, and we have no wish to see this anonymous person degraded: but we trust, for the sake of decency, to say nothing of higher feelings, that a person who so very plainly denies the truth and obligation of the Prayer-book, has ceased to minister in our Church.

A volume of '*Sermons,*' by Mr. Greville Phillimore, (Rivingtons,) is not above the average; and that average is, we are told again and again, not a high one. Who, may we ask, is '*Gregory of Nazianzen?*' p. 113. We do not say that these sermons are in any way objectionable, but our wonder is to see them in print. That a sermon is simply sensible and sound is no reason for publishing it.

Mr. Woodford has, by a previous and successful volume, established his right to print sermons. Here we have a preacher with most of a preacher's

gifts, natural and acquired: rich and varied language, a full command of his subject, powers of illustration, and that tact which, so important in the preacher's office, refers the Gospel precepts and sentiments to the emergencies of the day. This volume of 'Occasional Sermons,' (Masters,)—most were delivered on some public or special occasion—is really a contribution to our literature.

Lord Lyttelton's edition of the 'Gospel and Acts, with Short Notes,' (Rivingtons,) is a very pleasing memorial of a Christian nobleman doing his duty in the simplest and most practical way. A man of Lord Lyttelton's social and political eminence does not, as it was once the fashion to say, adorn the Gospel which he professes, by his earnest and resolute attendance at Sunday-schools, and in his quiet Scripture readings in his own household; but he illustrates the Churchman's character. He, among that cluster of noble persons, the Glynnes, the Gladstones, and the like, recalls other and better days, or rather he auspices a better future for us in State alike and in Church. The notes are, like the writer, of the most intelligible earnest sort: not without inaccuracies, some of which we had marked; but it is better to let the volume stand on its substantial merits.

'Memorialia Cordis,' (Masters,) is a small, very small, collection of poems, printed in minute and nearly unreadable characters. The writer is Mr. C. J. Black; and if, which will be a difficulty owing to the type, our readers can master them, they will be rewarded. They are mostly studies, prolusions, and essayings of the poetic wing: but full of promise. A volume of Mr. Black's, 'Messias and anti-Messias,' led us to anticipate well of him; and this little collection fulfils some of our expectations.

Among the many Manuals for establishing and keeping Aquaria, we must specify, both as cheap and really effective, Bishop's 'Plain Instructions for the Management of the Aquarium.' (Dean.) It is a working book; confined, however, to the fresh-water tank.

Dr. Maitland is, we must say it, a provoking writer. He seems to delight in tantalizing his readers. He begins a subject, exhibits the most rich and prolific stores of information and research in examining it, and leaves his premises without a conclusion. It is well known that for years he has been engaged in investigating the modern miracles and wonders. He began an Essay on Superstition and Science: he has said enough to stimulate us all on the subjects of alleged spiritualism, on mesmerism, and the like. Our curiosity, our interest, our duties, are probed to the quick; but we are left, after all, only excited and roused; never satisfied. We do not think this quite fair. Let us understand Dr. Maitland: if he has a clear view of the invisible world, and the present personal operations of evil spirits, is it not a duty to put Christians on their guard? Have we not a right to know how much of certain notorious phenomena, or of alleged phenomena, he believes to be fact—how much is illusion, conscious or other—how much sheer imposture and delusion. Occasionally Dr. Maitland seems to adopt as fact all Dr. Gregory's and Reichenbach's assertions about the odylic lights, and even to look favourably, as fact, at table-turning, and the like super-

naturalism. If Dr. Maitland is really certain of these facts, and is ready to assign them to demoniac influence, we ought to know this. Nothing coming from one like Dr. Maitland is unimportant: his writings are too valuable not to tell. And while he leaves things of this consequence vague, he may very unintentionally do as much harm as we are sure that his investigation of any subject would do good. What leads us to say this, is the appearance of a little work of surprising interest, and still greater learning, an 'Essay on False Worship,' (Rivingtons.) We perhaps should have styled it an Essay towards an Essay, &c. And the rather are we enforced to ask this plain speaking at Dr. Maitland's hands, since his speculations, or, perhaps, conclusions, are no recent matter. He has of late years reprinted his early work, 'Eruvin;' in which, and in certain disquisitions on the state of the pre-diluvian earth, the germs of his present views are to be detected. What, of course, we have to account for, is not the possibility of reconciling so-called 'Spiritualism' with Scriptural revelations, but the novelty of its present manifestations. One thing is quite certain, that if, as Dr. Maitland seems to intimate, we are to accept the facts, we must conclude that the notion of spiritual *intelligences* not only does not imply any superiority, but does not require any degree of intellect, as we understand it in the terrestrial spheres.

We group together a cloud, rather than a galaxy, of publications connected with, or suggested by, the late war. 1. 'War and Peace,' a Sermon, preached at S. Paul's, by Dean Milman, (Murray,) not equal to the preacher's most remarkable—why unpublished?—sermon after the Duke of Wellington's funeral, but one which will sustain, if it does not enlarge, Dr. Milman's reputation. 2. 'A Peace Thanksgiving Sermon,' by the author of 'National Humiliation,' (Darling;) an average discourse. 3. 'Peace: its Privileges and Duties,' (Darling;) tame and commonplace. 4. 'War: its Lawfulness; Peace: its Blessing,' by Mr. Jordan Palmer, (Skeffington,) of which the speciality is, that the author thinks Aquila was a woman, and spells maratime with two *a*'s. 5. 'Peace, God's Gift,' by Mr. H. Hayman, Assistant Preacher at the Temple, (Skeffington;) serviceable, but certainly within the preacher's great capacities. 6. 'The Lessons of the War,' preached at Leeds, by Mr. Barry, (Harrison;) better, but still not up to the preacher's powers. 7. 'Peace,' the substance of two Sermons preached at Crawley, by Mr. W. B. Flower, (Masters;) warm, and much more like pulpit addresses, and which we should commend without restriction, were it not for one affectation. Appended to a sentence containing the words, 'O Jesus, full of saving grace, fountain never-failing,' &c., we find the note, 'It is needless to add, that these ideas are contained in S. Bernard's beautiful stanzas,' &c. It is very needful to add, for (we speak for ourselves at least) not one reader in fifty thousand, if Mr. Flower gets—and he deserves—as many, is aware of the fact. 8. 'The English Church at Constantinople,' a Sermon at Grantham, by Mr. Street. (Hedge.) A very good sermon. In connexion with it, we may call attention to the lamentable proceedings connected with Bishop Gobat's proceedings in the East. Not only is this unhappy person,—unhappy in the actual

mischief which he is causing, unhappy in the scandal which he is attracting to the Church of England, and unhappy in the dismay which his schismatical proceedings have caused among our faithful members,—sedulously engaged in proselytizing from the Oriental Churches, and giving the lie to the pledge solemnly undertaken by the late Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop Blomfield; but in a recent tour in Scotland, he has openly held communion with the so-called English Episcopalians. Nor is this all; the Scotch Bishops have appealed to the Archbishop of Canterbury; and in his reply Dr. Sumner has not only fully adopted Dr. Gobat's proceedings, but adding affront to injustice, forgetting the Christian gentleman as well as the Primate of all England, the Archbishop of Canterbury has informed the Scotch Bishops that he is much pleased at Bishop Gobat's report of the flourishing state of the Scotch schismatical assemblies. Is there not a text about 'rejoicing in iniquity?' 9. 'The War and the Newspapers.' (Mayer.) A lecture, and a very forcible one, delivered by Mr. Kennaway, at Ottery S. Mary. It denounces—adopting much of the well-known and spirited protests of the 'Saturday Review'—the mischief and folly of 'Our own Correspondent.'

'Three Suggestive Discourses,'—we miss the *suggestive* force of the epithet,—(Hayes,) are by Mr. Skinner, of S. Barnabas. We cannot venture to pronounce upon local requirements, but however well fitted for individuals, we should have questioned the policy of preaching these sermons. Nevertheless, they are well reasoned, and suitable to their object—that of staying possible defections Romewards. Is Mr. Skinner quite accurate in his *precis* of the De Dominis case? and certainly Archbishop Laud never published anything against the book called 'Naked Truth.' (p. 45.)

On the subject of Social Burthens of the Clergy, one in which it was our privilege to lead the way in this Review, we have to mention, among others, 1. a complete and exhaustive 'Letter to Mr. Gladstone,' by Mr. Ridley, of Hambleden.' (Bell & Daldy.) This really says all that ought to be said, and it is much, on the indirect burthens of the Clergy, especially as to the abatements which, in justice, must be made from the assessment of the rent-charge. And it very forcibly brings out the amount of necessary though informal deductions to which every Clergyman's income is liable. Also, 2. which is more specially concerned with the legal and technical aspect of the case, Mr. C. A. Stevens' 'Remarks on the Rating of the Tithe Commutation Rent-Charge.' (Rivingtons.) By the way, Mr. Stevens corrects Mr. Ridley's—the popular—assumption that six per cent. is (*Rex v. Capel*) a fair estimate of the cost and risk of collecting the rent-charge. We desire especial attention to these two pamphlets. Mr. Stevens does good service in bringing very prominently forward the rating of the value of the personal labour of the parish priest, merely, to speak according to the card, as a skilled labourer.

On the Sunday Question, we select for commendation, 1. Dr. Hook's 'The Lord's Day,' (Murray,) a Sermon, with notes, &c. This is by far

the ablest publication on the subject; and among Dr. Hook's many and ill-requited services to the Church of England, we do not recal one which does him greater credit. In the midst of certain and wilful misrepresentation, boldly to vindicate the true and old Church of England doctrine on this subject, required just that sort of free, earnest, English spirit which marks the Vicar of Leeds. His suggestions, both on recreation, and the sort of recreation, allowable on Sunday, and his distinct protest against Sunday labour, are alike forcible and temperate. The only point which we could wish enlarged is the Catechism's interpretation of the Fourth Commandment as connected with the Christian rest from sin, that is, from our natural works, 'all the days of our life.' We note a literary oversight: 'Bishop Cosin, one of those most oppressed by the Puritans in the reign of Charles I., is' *not* 'regarded as the author of that portion of the Church Catechism which relates to the sacraments,' (p. 69,) seeing that it was added in 1604, and, as is generally believed, by Bishop Overall. 2. Mr. Roundell Palmer's 'Speech on Sir Joshua Walmsley's Motion,' (J. H. Parker): to say it was the best delivered on the subject is small praise. 3. Mr. De Burgh's 'The Christian Sabbath,' (Rivingtons,) is learnedly and closely reasoned. 4. 'How to keep Sunday,' (Hatchard,) by Captain Williams, R.N., begins by mistaking the object of Dr. Hook's Sermon, as though he taught that 'its religious duties are matters of human arrangement.' The cure, of course, is characteristic: Dr. Hook says that the religion of the Sunday is a matter of the *Church's* arrangement: Dr. Hook thinks the Church to be divine, Captain Williams human. However, the gallant Captain is a well-meaning person, only a little out of his depth in theology.

Mr. J. H. Parker has published the first part of 'A Plain Commentary on the Book of Psalms.' Here we have to remark that this undertaking supplies a great want. As *the* guide to the spiritual life, the Psalms are, after all, the fittest manual; and yet their very familiarity may be a hindrance to their understanding. This Commentary, devotional at once and expository, cheap and compact, and, above all, taking as its text the familiar,—may we not add better?—Prayer-Book Version, meets the case. It is more manageable than Bishop Horne, and will do much to supply the place of manuals, the popularity of which is to be attributed rather to the fact that they have taken up the ground, than to their doctrinal trustworthiness.

'The Oxford Sermons on the Atonement,' delivered against Professor Jowett's untoward speculations, have been collected in a handsome volume, (J. H. Parker,) and in this form are enriched by a catena—or sketch of a catena—of patristic and other authorities.—Dublin has added an able sermon on this subject, an 'Act Sermon,' by Mr. J. C. MacDonnell, (Hodges,) which deserves a place with the Oxford refutations.

Mrs. Bunbury, 'the kind aunt' of 'Henry Shirley Bunbury, aged twelve years,' has done a very unkind and injudicious thing in publishing that little gentleman's 'The Error Corrected, or the Faithful Priest.' (Masters.)

When little boys write little books, a little fire is what a sensible friend would suggest. We have not read, nor do we counsel anybody else to read, this production. We are asked 'to judge leniently of . . . the motives that led to its publication.' As we are not informed what those motives are, we choose to condemn them *in toto*.

If our readers, for school-gifts and the like, want something which really suits children, and which are written by those who know what children ought to have, we suggest Miss Young's two little stories, 'Leonard the Lion-Heart' and 'Ben Sylvester's Word.' (Mozley.) It is astonishing what sharp discrimination of character and life-like touches of the true artist these miniature portraits display.

Mr. Molyneux, the Incumbent of Sudbury, has addressed a 'Letter to the Lord Bishop of Ely,' (J. H. Parker,) which is just the thing to make episcopal and other ears tingle. It is on the Pew System, and in the most sensible and common-sense way urges everything that can be said against appropriated seats. Sure we are that one-half of our actual expenses in building new churches might be saved by properly using the existing ones. Mr. Molyneux constructs a catena from the 'Record' to the 'Christian Remembrancer'—in processions the place of honour is the last—embracing the editor of the 'Times' and a dissenting teacher, all denouncing the Pew System on the score of propriety, religion, economy, justice, and policy. Sooner or later, (sooner rather than later,) appropriated pews must go.

Mr. Tinkler of Landbeach has, in the form of a pamphlet, 'Scripture and Tradition,' (Hamilton, Adams & Co.) with some amount of reading, and in an engaging style, arrived at the conclusion that the soul sleeps after death; that the ministration of angels has been put an end to under the Gospel economy; that Baptism is not the conveyance of a gift; and that the Eucharist is a symbolical teaching, rather than in itself a channel of grace. What surprises us is that Mr. Tinkler, on his own principles, does not see that all this is *his* tradition; and that as he will not accept the received conclusions of the vast majority of Christians in all ages, we are under neither obligation nor disposition to pay the slightest attention to his traditions.

The Society some time since established for making known on the Continent the position and claims of our Church, issues from time to time its useful publications. We have received—'La Supremacia Papal,' a Spanish version of Mr. James Meyrick's tract, and 'De la Validité des Ordinations de l'Eglise Anglicane,' a translation of a well-known publication by Mr. Oldknow, (J. H. Parker;) also a Spanish version of Mr. Frederick Meyrick's compilation from Cosin and others, which has already appeared in French and Italian. The title of this last is 'Religion, Disciplina y Sagrados Ritos de la Iglesia de Inglaterra,' &c. (J. H. Parker.)

A second completed volume of Mr. Newland's spirited and useful series, 'Sermons on the Seasons of the Church,' (Mozley,) shows no lack of vigour in the editor. This collection fulfils its claims, and we cannot give it higher praise.

'The Bishop of Tasmania's Charge of 1855,' (Hobart Town: Best,) has either reached us very late, or we owe an apology to the author for so tardy an acknowledgment of it. It is important, not only on account of the excellent tone which characterises it, but as announcing the establishment of a 'Church Sustentation Fund,' for the maintenance of existing Clergy and Schoolmasters, the support of aged and infirm Clergy, and for the building and repairing of churches, schools, and parsonages. This—and we note other signs—shows that the Colonies are awakening to the duty of maintaining their own churches.

A Lecture on the 'Philosophy of Kant,' (J. H. Parker,) by Mr. Henry Mansel, though, from the nature of the case, quite inadequate to the extent and difficulty of the subject, shows the lecturer's fitness for his task. It must be criticised, however, remembering that, in its original form it was the conclusion of a series. What, however, most concerns ourselves is the testimony borne by Mr. Mansel, both to the fact of the Kantian pantheism, and to the dangers of philosophical study, without the balance of a firm faith in a personal God.

1. A simple and appropriate 'Sermon, preached at the Bishop of Oxford's Ordination,' by the Bishop of Moray, (J. H. Parker;) 2. a very deep and consoling 'Sermon,' at S. Matthias, Stoke Newington, 'The Life of Objective Faith,' by Mr. Carter, of Clewer, (Masters;) 3. 'The Fruits of Divine Love,' by Mr. James Anderson, preached at Bristol, for the Diocesan Clergy Fund, (Rivingtons,) which is far in advance of this writer's works, as familiar, at least, to ourselves; and 4. a Sermon to Mourners, 'Lessons of Bereavement,' (J. H. Parker,) by Mr. Barker, of Queen's College, Oxford, delivered in Barbados, after the cessation of the yellow fever, and under circumstances of especial trial to the preacher, *haud ignarus mali miseris succurrere disco*, single themselves from the crowd of single and occasional Sermons.

On the Wesleyan question we have several publications; the most important are, 1. Mr. Gresley's reprint of John Wesley on the 'Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice,' (Masters,) which, if not in all respects equal to the whole doctrine, yet shows a deep and very spiritual estimate of the great Christian mystery. If the Wesleyans now, which we much doubt, accept this teaching, the difficulties of their return are already disposed of. 2. 'A Letter to the Members of a Methodist Society,' &c., (Masters,) pursuing, what has been so often urged, the argument on the drifting of the Societies from their founder's principles.

Two Sermons, 'The Son of Consolation,' preached at the school of All Saints, Bloxham, the one by Mr. F. J. Manning, the other by Mr. Hake, (Masters,) on S. Bartholomew's day, are both good: but the first for suitability to the occasion and as a specimen of how schoolboys ought to be addressed, might serve as a model.

From the United States we have received not much, but the chief matter to acknowledge and recommend is 'Exclusiveness,' a Lecture delivered at Troy, by Dr. Coit, (Troy: Young,) which though having an immediate purpose, and being addressed to a specific opponent, in fulness, strength of

argument, and tone, shows that while our American brethren are necessarily led by their position into an aggressive attitude, yet that they can maintain it not only with firmness to their own principles, but with courtesy to the Sectarians.

The improved tone of public schools is one of the most hopeful signs of the times. Mr. Woodard's success may well be great if he can surround himself by such men as his general staff consists of. Mr. Lowe's Sermon, 'The Image of God,' preached at the College Chapel, Hurstpierpoint, (Masters,) higher as a composition and more scholarly in form than Mr. Manning's, which we have already commended, is not inferior to it in a religious and practical tone.

To those who have heard the Bishop of Exeter's very striking and really pastoral addresses to the young people at Confirmation, the substance of one of them delivered at Bampton, and published by the clergymen of that place, under the title, 'Confirmation, its Duties and Privileges,' (Masters,) will be a pleasant memorial of the Bishop; but to others this little tract will be useful.

'The History and Antiquities of St. David's,' (J. H. Parker,) by Messrs. Jones and E. A. Freeman, has reached us so late in the quarter, that we are prevented from doing more than acknowledging a sumptuous volume, which does credit to the publisher's taste, and to the interest and skill which he must have expended in producing it. St. David's, that ancient Menevia, presents great claims on the historian, and its history is because so melancholy, so instructive. The fruitless struggles to maintain, perhaps to acquire, the title—for the authority would never have accompanied it—of Metropolitan, seem rather to have weakened than to have condensed the real authority of the see, and perhaps, more than anything else, the peculiarly unfortunate site of the church has contributed to the same result. The anomalous condition of the see in recent times, with its non-resident Bishop as its Dean, and its imported English prelates, have combined with its other untoward fortunes against St. David's. A better future seems to loom, and already some creditable restorations of the fabric may be the forerunners of a spiritual re-edification of this deserted see. The Church, according to the present historians' account, exhibits many features of architectural interest, and the roof seems to be unique, and of a splendour almost barbarously rich. Our curiosity leads us to ask, why we have not a view of Mr. Nash's West Front? We observe a very racy sketch of Giraldus Cambrensis, which it must have been a labour of love to Mr. Freeman to draw. It is superfluous to say, in the case of one of Mr. John H. Parker's works, that the scientific illustrations are beautiful and complete.

Dr. Peter Maurice is well known at Oxford,—better known than—but, apologetically, is a useful figure. He has indited a Letter to 'My Lord Chancellor,' meaning Lord Derby, which, like the writer, is a curiosity. We cannot, as is our custom, give the publisher; for, much to the credit of the craft, we suppose the Sosii of our times declined the honour of Dr. Peter Maurice's

patronage. The doctor is his own publisher on the same principle, or at least with the same results, that some people are their own lawyers. If Dr. Maurice had confined himself to his own subject, that of music, we should not have interfered with his skimble-skamble writing. But he takes upon himself to settle the sense of Scripture; and he really hints that 1 Cor. i. 23 was prophetically said in reference to the present state of the University of Oxford. 'To the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness,' the learned doctor applies respectively to the two Regius Professors, Dr. Pusey and Mr. Jowett.—'Have we not a sect in Oxford'—anyhow it is two sects—'who stumble at the doctrine of the Apostle? &c. Is not reserve in the doctrine of the Atonement, the *Hebrew professor* being the avowed Choragus, the leading note of their scale? and can we be surprised if at last *Greek* should furnish an University, where heathen morals have been the food from tender years of its choicest alumni, with a *professor* to whom (to say the least of it) the doctrine of the Atonement is foolishness?' (p. 4.) Here is a piece of statistics which is important. 'As near as can be ascertained, upon inquiry at the respective Colleges, there are about 120 pianos, 10 harmoniums, 30 flutes, 20 violins and other stringed instruments, 30 concertinas and acordians (*sic*), 18 cornets, besides other instruments.' (p. 22.) With the 'Hebrew professor's' influence, it is well for the peace of Oxford that he has not revived the practice of the received national instrument—the Jew's harp.

If, which is not, and which is not likely to be the case, the question of the proper vestment for the preacher could be settled either by argument, or by authority, or by convenience, we should all long since have quietly subsided into the surplice. Such is not the case. We do not, therefore, anticipate much, if any, success for Mr. Cecil Wray's 'Short Inquiry, &c., whether the Surplice or Black Gown should be worn during the Sermon.' (Masters.) But it is an argument well constructed and ably conducted, and ought to command assent.

Among the confutations of Professor Jowett's recent attacks on the doctrine of the Atonement, we ought to single out, as especially remarkable for philosophical depth and power of argument, as well as especially valuable as coming from a disciple of Mr. Maurice, Mr. Llewellyn Davies's 'S. Paul and Modern Thought.' (Macmillan.)

Dr. Acland combines, and we trust that the union is not rare, the scholar, the Christian, and the physician. In his 'Suggestions on Health, Work, and Play,' (J. H. Parker,) a chapter from his remarkable and well-known 'Report on the Cholera in Oxford,' he says more and better on 'common things,' and in a higher spirit, than most of our lecturers. The tract is eminently beautiful.

INDEX TO VOL. XXXII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Arago, François [*Arago's Popular Astronomy, translated, &c., Herschel's Astronomy, &c.*], 103—140. Popular science, 103. Difficulties of popular science, 104—107; experiment, 108, 109; illustrative machinery, 110—114; popular astronomy, 114—116. Herschel's and Arago's works, 117. Herschel's manner, 119; discovery of the planet Neptune, 121—128. Arago's work, 126; criticisms on, 127—140.

B.

Bible, Proposed Revision of the Authorized Version of the [*Publications of Messrs. Harness, Selwyn, Macon, &c.*], 451—499. Popular assent to the Authorized Version, 451. Movement in favour of Revision, 452; in America, 452, 453. Mr. Harness in the *Edinburgh Review*, 454, 455. End and purpose of Holy Scripture, 456; what a translation must be, 457; always inadequate, 458—461; no material errors in the Authorized Version, 462—477; how far a revision is desirable, 477. Mr. Sharpe, 478. Dr. Turnbull, 479. Dr. Peile, 480. Mr. Stanley, 481, 482. Mr. Elliott, 483, 484. Revision of the text, 485, 486; effects of a new Version on the people, 487—490; difficulties of introducing a new Version, 490—493; by whom are changes to be made, 494—497. Mr. Elliott on the subject, 497—499.

Biography, Religious [*Memoirs of Hewitson, Miss Newton, Mr. Hedley Vicars, &c.*], 141—198. Popularity of biography, 141; religious biography, 142—144. Baillie's Memoirs,—Memoir of Mr. Hewitson, 145—161.

NO. XCIV.—N.S.

Memoir of Miss Newton, 162—171. Memoir by Mr. Horatius Bonar, 172—181. Memoir of Captain Hedley Vicars, 182—193. Reflections on religious biography, 196—198.

C.

Chaucer [*Bell's Edition of Chaucer*], 327—356. England still mediæval, 327. Bell's Chaucer, 328; previous editions, 329. Chaucer's extraction and education, 330—332. Testament and Court of Love, 333—336. Allegories, 337, 338. Poems of communism and liberalism, 339—342. Chaucer's personal history, 343—347. House of Fame, 348, 349. Troilus and Criseyde, 350, 351. The Canterbury Tales, 352—354. End of Chaucer's life, 355, 356.

Consistorial Court, Judgment in Westerton v. Liddell [*Dr. Lushington's Judgment in, Bishop of Exeter's Letter to Dr. Lushington, &c.*], 27—63. Westerton and his motives, 27. Dr. Lushington's Judgment, 28; the Homilies, *ibid*; Queen Elizabeth's Injunctions, 29; Crosses, 30; historical and documentary proof of the continued use of Crosses and other excepted ornaments, &c. 30—63.

D.

Denison Case, The [*Grueber's Tabular View, &c.*], 506—506. The Clevedon inquiry, 501; constitution of the Bath Court, *ibid*; rejection of the objections of Dr. Phillimore, *ibid*; characteristics of the trial, 502—505; prospects, 506.

M M

E.

England, Social and Religious before the Reformation [*Froude's History of England, Annals of England, &c.*], 64—102. Froude's history—documents, 64—66; England in the fifteenth century, 67; failure of materials, 68; laxity of discipline, 69; and corruption of social morals, 70—75; clerical abuses, 76—86; morals of the clergy, 87, 88; monasteries, 89—92; higher ecclesiastics, 93, 94; bishops, 95—98; abatement of the evil, 101, 102.

G.

Gallican Church, Present State of the [*Guettée's History of the Church of France, &c.*], 423—450. Renewed struggle against Ultramontaniam in France, 423; Guettée's heresy, 424; suspected, 425; defended, 426; *L'Observateur Catholique*, 427, 428; the Abbé Laborde, 429—435; declaration of the Dutch bishops, 436—438; the Gallican offices, 438; *Lettres Parisiennes*, 439—441; the articles of 1682, 442—449; prospects of the Gallican Church, 450.

H.

Herschel, Sir John's, Astronomy (see Arago).

I.

Imperialism [*Congreve on the Roman Empire, Montalembert on England, &c.*], 265—326. Nothingness of political rule to the Christian, 265; personal happiness independent of government, 266; but still the subject important to a Christian, 267. Imperialism, 268; fourfold, 268, 269; common characteristics of Imperialism, 270; its alleged advantages, 271—282; its evils, 283, 284; its influence on religion, 285—287; on liberty of thought, 288, 289; Antichrist, 290. How has France arrived at Imperial government? 291—311; is it probable that England will follow the example? 311, 312. Mr. Congreve, 313, 315. Mr. Goldwin Smith's reply, 316, 317. English institutions, 318. M. Montalembert, 319

—321. Social dangers, 321—325; and hopes, 326.

J.

Jewish Nation, the [*Edersheim's History, Raphael's History, &c.*], 357—422. Exceptional character of the Jews, 357. Edersheim's history, 358; criticisms on it and Dr. Raphael's work, 359—368. The New Testament the only reliable source of later Jewish history, 369. General sketch of the political state of the Jews at the time of the incarnation, 370—422.

L.

Lushington, Dr. (see Consistorial Court, Judgment in the).

M.

Mozley on Regeneration [*The Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, &c.*], 199—256. The author's previous work on Predestination, 199; objections to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, *ibid.* Mr. Mozley's explanation, 200; limitations, 201; the rule of supposition, 202; illustrated by Scripture, 203—206; arguments against this view, 207—210. Whether regeneration implies actual holiness? 211—216. The nature of regeneration itself, 217—227. The Fathers misrepresented, 227—232; two senses of regenerate, 233. S. Augustine's doctrine of regeneration, 235—242; as connected with that of final perseverance, 243—253. Sufficiency of grace, 254; conclusion, 255, 256.

S.

Stephen's Lectures on the History of France, &c., 1—26. Why so hastily published? 1, 2. Character and influence of Charlemagne, 3—11. Decline and Fall of the Merovingian and Carolingian dynasties, 12—14. The Crusades, 14—17; relative growth of the English and French monarchies, 18—24. Theory of the Divine right of Kings, 25, 26.

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

JULY.—Recent Publications of the Clarendon Press, Burnet's Life of Hale, Fell's Life of Hammond, Smalridge's Sermons, Carte's Life of Ormond, &c.—Brudenell Barter on the Progress of Infidelity—Lynch's Rivulet, Grant and Campbell, &c.—Lester's Letter to Lord Palmerston—Shaw on the Church and Wesleyans—Flemish Interiors—Essai sur la Réforme Catholique, par M.M. Bordas Dumoulin et Huet—Dr. Mill's Lectures on the Catechism—Pye's Ordination Sermon—Instrumenta Ecclesiastica—J. H. Parker's Cottage Prints—Annals of England—Gilderdale's *Disciplina Rediviva*—Postscript, &c.

OCTOBER.—Defence of Archdeacon Denison—Grueber on Articles XXV. XXVIII. XXIX. and Letter to Archbishop of Canterbury—Bishop of Ripon's Charge—Harper on Clerical Incomes—Baker on School Systems—Gurney's Consecration Sermon—Lays of Memory—Irons' Sermon—Cazenove on Mahometanism—Denison on Church Building—Peel's Memoirs—Archer Gurney's Poems—Lonely Hours—Freeman on the Saracens—Thiersch on the Family Life—Blunt on Duties of Parish Priest—Wortarbet's Syria—Life of Bishop Torrey—Neale's Mediæval Preaching—Oxenden's Pathway of Safety—Hare's Epitaphs—Wilkins' Threescore Years and Ten—Midsummer Holidays—The Eng-

lish Hymnal—Stories on the Commandments—Whitehead's Sermons—Pratt on Scripture and Science—Lyall's Agonistes—Sponsorial Stipulations, &c.—Phillimore's Sermons—Woodford's Sermons—Lord Lyttelton on the Gospels and Acts—Memorialia Cordis—The Aquarium—Maitland on False Worship—Sermons on the Peace by Dean Milman, Messrs. Palmer, Hayman, Barry, Flower, Street, Kennaway, &c.—Sermons by Mr. Skinner—Ridley and Stevens on Clerical Burthens—Dr. Hook, Mr. Roundell Palmer, Mr. De Burgh, and Captain Williams, on Sunday Observances—Commentary on the Psalms—Oxford Sermons on the Atonement—MacDonnell on ditto—Bunbury's Tale—Leonard the Lion Heart and Ben Sylvester's Word—Molyneux's Letter—Tinkler on Tradition—Tracts on Church for foreign use—Newland's Sermons on Church Seasons—Bishop of Tasmania's Charge—Mansel's Lecture on Kant—Sermons by Bishop of Moray, Messrs. Carter, Anderson, and Barker—Gresley on Methodism—Sermons by Manning and Hake—Coit's Lecture on Exclusiveness—Lowe's Sermon—Bishop of Exeter's Address at Confirmation—Jones and Freeman on St. David's Cathedral, &c.—Dr. Maurice's Letter to Lord Derby—Cecil Wray on the Surplice—Davies' St. Paul and Modern Thought—Dr. Acland on Health, Work, and Play, &c.



